Vol I of this magazine was published under the title The Religious Cabinet.

Library of
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY

BRIGHTON, MASSACHUSETTS

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON MASS.

THE

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC MAGAZINE.

AUGUST, 1843.

THE SPANISH INQUISITION.

History of the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, the Catholic. By William H. Prescott. 3 vols. 8vo. pp. 411, 509, and 496. Boston. Fifth edition, 1839.

THE history of no country, perhaps, is invested with greater interest than that of Spain. Her annals are varied in incident, rich in moral, and full of instruction for the philosopher and Christian. No country of Europe has preserved the spirit of mediæval chivalry so pure, or for so long a time. This spirit is impressed on all her institutions, and is yet visible in the high character and lofty bearing of her people. The type of her national character is still, to a great extent, that of the ancient knights of St. Iago of Calatrava and of Alcantara; the only difference is, that it has been softened down to suit the more pacific tendencies of the present age. Her whole history is replete with strange vicissitudes and startling occurrences.

No country, perhaps, has exercised a more powerful influence on civilization in Europe, or done more to extend its boundaries into regions remote and before unknown. But for the liberal enterprise and enlightened policy of her sovereigns, the ardor of Columbus might have cooled, and America remained undiscovered for centuries. With the names of Alfonso the Wise, of Sancho the Great, and of Ferdinand and Isabella, among her princes and legislators; with those of Don Rodrigo Diaz del Bivar, the renowned *Campion* or Cid, and of Gonsalvo de Cordova, the "great captain," among her generals; and with those of Calderon, Lope de Vega, Cervantes, Herrara and Garcilass among her *literati*, not to mention many others, she has little to fear from comparison with any other nation. The calendar is crowded with the names of her saints; St. Dominic, St. Vincent Ferrer, St. Teresa, St. Peter of Alcantara, St. Ignatius, St. Francis Xavier, and hosts of others are her patrons in heaven.

The interest in Spanish history and institutions is greatly increased by the present distracted condition of that unhappy country. The storm which is now sweeping over Spain, threatens to destroy almost every monument of her former greatness, and to carry away every vestige of the middle age. Though not so violent as that which desolated France fifty years ago, yet it is similar to this in many other respects. It was an evil day for Spain when her soil became the theatre of a sanguinary struggle between the hosts of France and England. All her present evils date from that ill-fated period. The Peninsular war sowed upon her soil the seeds of French infidelity and of English Protestantism, and

these seeds are now producing their bitter fruits. And it is remarkable, that the late startling proceedings in Spain have been accordingly distinguished by the fierce fanaticism of the French revolution, tempered with the cold, calculating policy of the reformation in England under Henry VIII. We trace the policy of England in the invasion of Church property, and in the destruction of the monasteries; and that of France in the massacre of the monks at Barcelona and elsewhere.

What will be the final result of this great struggle, the future alone can reveal. Whether the ardent faith of the Spaniard will come out of the fiery ordeal warmer and brighter than ever, or whether that faith will grow cold or be obscured in the furnace we are not at present prepared to say. One thing is certain. The climate of Spain is too *warm* for Protestantism; on *her* soil, the Protestant sects would be exotics which could have but a sickly growth at best, and which would soon wither and die. The only climate at all congenial with Protestantism is the cold, calculating north; it is too dreary, too devoid of feeling and soul, to suit the ardent temperament of the south.* The Spaniards are too thoroughly Catholic, ever to be tainted, at least to any great extent, by the errors of the last three centuries. The late appeal of the sovereign pontiff in behalf of suffering Spain, has met with such a response, in the bosoms of millions all over the world, as bespeaks Catholic unity, and tells of the depths of that sympathy, which flows from Catholic charity! Only the Catholic Church can present the spectacle of the whole world thus forgetting every sectional and political difference, and, at the voice of one old man, kneeling before one common altar, and in divine unison of faith and feeling, praying for one great object! That prayer *will* be heard, and Spain *will* be preserved to the Church!

Mr. Prescott has selected for the subject of his work the most interesting and brilliant period of Spanish history. The age of Ferdinand and Isabella is to Spain, what that of Louis XIV was subsequently to France; and what, immediately after, the pontificate of Leo X was to Italy and to the world. It was the era in which she laid broad and deep the foundations of that solid glory, which made her for more than two centuries the first country in Europe. It was the age which witnessed the glories of Ponce de Leon, and of Gonsalvo de Cordova, in the field; of Cardinals Mendoza and Ximenes, in the cabinet; and of Christopher Columbus on the broader field of the world, discovering a new continent. Mr. Prescott could scarcely have chosen a loftier theme. And he has brought to the execution of his task a great amount of learning, as well as much industry and care in the arrangement of his copious materials. His work manifests a degree of research into Spanish history highly creditable to the author; the more so, as in its preparation he had to encounter for a time the almost insuperable obstacle of almost total blindness.* Such works may be often met with in Italy or Germany, and occasionally in France or England, but they are extremely rare in our light and frivolous age, and yet more so in our republic, where the *utilitarian* system of estimating everything in dollars and cents, has perhaps taken deeper root than any where else in the world. The United States may well be proud of two such historians as Prescott and Bancroft.

It is not our purpose to furnish a lengthy review of Mr. Prescott's history. It is before the American community and may speak for itself. In our opinion the style is more natural, and better adapted to historical narrative than the more florid manner of Bancroft, who seems to have caught no little of the *Bulwerian* and *transcendental* infection of the age. What is, however, most pleasing in the history of Ferdinand and Isabella, is the array of learned references,

* See a late work by Mr. J. Balmes, published at Madrid in 1840, a large extract from which appears in the January number of this Magazine. The writer of this article not long since conversed with a very intelligent Spaniard, the son of a distinguished Spanish nobleman, who amply confirmed this statement; and added that the vast majority of the Spanish nobility and grandees were not only thoroughly Catholic, but were also distinguished for their piety.

* See his Preface.

by which each statement is sustained. Not only is every original document and work cited, but the very edition and page are carefully marked, so as to facilitate, in a high degree, the researches of the scholar who might feel disposed to verify the quotations. The statements of the author may be relied on, wherever he confines himself to facts, unless when he views them through the improper medium of undue prejudice, or is misled, as to the facts themselves, by prejudiced authority. Then he either greatly miscolors, or wholly perverts the facts. We will endeavor to show that he has committed both these faults in the seventh chapter of his first volume, pp. 230—269, where he gives a detailed history of the "modern Inquisition" in Spain; and our remarks on his history will be confined to this chapter.

That he was greatly under the influence of anticatholic prejudice, we infer from the whole tenor of the chapter, which is in fact as virulent a libel upon Catholicity as we have ever chanced to read. To prove that the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition was in accordance with the principles of the Catholic Church, he repeats* the stale calumny that a Catholic principle is embodied in the odious proposition, "*the end justifies the means.*" He turns out of his way to attack the Catholic doctrine of confession, which he designates† an "artful institution" of the priests, to gain influence with the people; and to show how Isabella's repugnance to the establishment of the inquisition was overcome, he relates a very simple, if not absurd anecdote of what passed between her and her confessor, Talavera.‡ In opposition to all history he still asserts that St. Dominic was the founder of the ancient Inquisition, or at least maintains that if he was not, in point of fact, he *ought* to have been.§ He tells, in a satirical tone, of the divine eloquence and wonderful miracles by which St. Vincent Ferrer, in the fourteenth century, converted to Christianity thirty-five thousand Spanish Jews.‖ The sufferings of this unfortunate people enlist his deepest sympathy; the Moors of Grenada have also his warmest feelings; these two people seem to have exhausted his stock of humanity, and he has no sympathy to throw away upon the Catholic Christians of Spain! Nor is he alone in this respect. It is the fault of most Protestant historians. Their sympathies run strongly in favor of Jew, Turk, or dissenter of every shade of opinion, while for the Catholic, they reserve the vials of their wrath! Is it, that there is a kindred spirit among errorists of every hue, a certain relationship which makes them have a *tender* feeling for one another? It would seem so. The chief severity of this remark consists in its *truth;* and we have only to open Protestant historians *passim,* to become persuaded of it. Mr. Prescott furnishes abundant evidence of this spirit throughout his work.

It was scarcely to be expected that, reared as he evidently had been in all the prejudices of Protestantism, Mr. Prescott should have become wholly divested of the early impressions of the nursery, so as to approach the subject of the horrible Spanish Inquisition, with a calm mind and a steady nerve. It was difficult to dispel the "bloody phantoms" of slaughtered victims, which had haunted his early days, and to get rid of the opinions in regard to that tribunal which had been fastened on his mind by the teachings of the press and of the pulpit. But at least, as a faithful historian, he should have exhibited its redeeming as well as its odious features; and to have qualified himself for this task, he should have read both sides, and not have suffered himself to be misled by violently prejudiced writers. That many of those whom he has followed are of this character, we will endeavor to show; and then we will glance rapidly at the principal works written in defence of the Inquisition, which Mr. Prescott seems either not to have seen at all, or not to have read.

The historians of the Spanish Inquisition most in favor with Protestants, are Limborch and Llorente. Mr. Prescott cites them both, and bases most of his statements upon the authority of the latter, who is so great a favorite with him as to merit a special

* Vol. i, p. 245. † Ibid. p. 246. ‡ Ibid.

§ This is the purport of his reasoning (p. 232, *note*). See La Cordaire's late work "Apology for the order of St. Dominic," in which this charge is ably refuted by undeniable evidence.

‖ Vol. i, p. 240.

biographical notice at the close of his chapter on the Inquisition. To ascertain how far they are to be relied on, as historians of the Inquisition, we must see who they were, under what circumstances they wrote their respective histories, and what motives prompted them to the task.

Philip Limborch was a native of Holland, and belonged to the sect of the Remonstrants or mitigated Calvinists. He was a disciple of the famous scholar, Vossius, who with Grotius had suffered so much from the intolerant synod of Dort, which in 1619 had consummated the division of the Dutch Calvinists. He attained to considerable eminence in his sect, in which he became a minister, and subsequently a professor of theology at Amsterdam. He was not, however, very rigid in adhering even to the slight standard of orthodoxy required by his own party; for he became a Unitarian, and was a great friend of the noted Unitarian, John Le Clerk, who lauds his writings to the skies. Had John Calvin been able to arise from his tomb, his recreant disciple might have stood a good chance to be bound to the stake with Servetus, whose tenets he advocated; and had the Gomarist, or rigid Calvinist party in Holland been unchecked in enforcing the exclusive and persecuting canons of Dort, Limborch might have suffered martyrdom, or at least have been a confessor with Grotius and Vossius.* However, he escaped unscathed, but with a deep and abiding sense of the wrongs his party had endured from the Gomarists. He determined to shoot an arrow at them through the Spaniards, whose very name had been execrated in Holland, since the days of Philip II of Spain, and of the duke of Alva. The memory of the fierce and bloody struggle with the Spaniards, in which so many harrowing scenes had occurred on both sides, was still fresh in the minds of the Dutch. To be sure they had, to say the least, been guilty of as much cruelty, as the duke of Alva and his soldiery; but this was forgotten, and the cruelty of the Spaniard was alone remembered, and that Inquisition which he had in vain endeavored to establish in the two countries was viewed with inconceivable horror. The very name caused a cold shudder to seize on every Hollander. Limborch shared deeply in these feelings, and he knew how extensive and how all absorbing they were among his countrymen. He knew that he could not better cater to their taste than by writing a detailed history of this odious tribunal: and he accordingly set about the work and published it in one volume folio, at Amsterdam, in 1692. His anticipations were realized; the work was received with acclamations. The minds of his countrymen were too much excited to enable them to perceive the glaring inaccuracies and gross misstatements of the book; and had he painted the horrors of the Inquisition with tenfold force, their deadly hatred of the tribunal would have caused them to devour the work without one misgiving!

Such was Limborch. He evidently wrote his history under such excitement as would naturally lead us to expect little of the impartiality of the historian, and much of the exaggeration of a man writing against a tribunal, odious, in a religious and political point of view, and pandering also to a taste greatly vitiated and highly excited. Accordingly we find in his work few of the intrinsic qualities of a veridical history. He professes to derive his statements from the works of the inquisitors themselves; yet Fra Paolo, the Italian historian of the council of Trent, whose hypocrisy made him conceal the mind and heart of a Protestant under the cowl of a Catholic friar, and Dellon, the famous *Protestant* author of the too famous "Relation of the Inquisition at Goa," are among his favorite authors for reference! And when he does cite the works of the inquisitors themselves, such as Eymerick, Pegna, &c. he garbles the extracts, quoting only what suits his purpose, very often extracting only the concluding sentence from a lengthy passage, and thereby often making the inquisitors say just the contrary of what they had intended. This wretched cutting up of quotations is unpardonable in a work so extensive; it would have been bad enough in a duodecimo, but in a folio

* See Brandt's History, copious extracts from which are cited in the Oral Discussion of Hughes and Breckenridge, on the second question.

volume it is utterly inexcusable, and is a strong evidence of bad faith in the writer.

No wonder that Voltaire and the infidels of France received the book with enthusiasm. It was just the kind of work they wanted. Its whole tendency was to throw odium on the Catholic priesthood, whom it represented as gloating over the blood of their victims. But we are a little surprised that the Abbé Marsollier, a cotemporary French Catholic priest, should have presented it, in an abridged form, to the French people in their own language, and that many very estimable French writers should have been misled by its statements. A morbid appetite seems to have seized upon the French people about that time. Writers, male and female, published works on Spain. Madame d'Aunoy wrote a book remarkable for its gross inaccuracy, in regard to the Spanish Inquisition, and for its caustic ridicule of every thing Spanish. The Abbé De Vayrac, who had spent twenty years of his active life in Spain, answered these misrepresentations in his famous work "L'Etat present d'Espagne," published at Amsterdam, in 1719, 4 vols. 12mo. He proved that the statements of Limborch and Madame d'Aunoy, in regard to the Spanish Inquisition, were greatly exaggerated, or positively false. No one was better calculated to write on Spanish affairs, than the Abbé; but so vitiated was the taste of his day, even in France, that the work caused a great outcry, and the author had to encounter a storm of opposition. In the preface to a second edition of his work, he ably defends himself from charges made against his statements under five different heads, with what effect on his cotemporaries, history does not tell. It is much to be regretted that this work of De Vayrac is not more generally known.

But the most popular history of the Spanish Inquisition among the enemies of this tribunal, is that by Don Juan Antonio Llorente, published at Paris, 1818, in four volumes, 8vo. A brief sketch of this remarkable man's life, will show us what motives elicited the publication of this work. He was born at Calahorra in Spain, A. D. 1756. He studied for the Church, took the degree of bachelor in theology, with considerable credit, and was ordained priest at an early age. A singular incident occurred at his ordination: after the consecration in which he had recited the sacred words of Christ, together with the ordaining bishop, he was seized with a sudden illness, which prevented his receiving the holy communion: some viewed the occurrence as ominous. His first work after ordination was a comedy "on matrimony,"* which, however, at the earnest solicitations of a friend, he consented to burn. When subsequently vicar general of the diocess of Calahorra, he composed another comedy, and had it acted on the stage, very little to the edification of the people and of the chapter of that city. So great was his passion for this kind of writing, that, when afterwards wholly engaged in politics, he employed his leisure hours in translating into Spanish many of the unchaste poems of the lascivious Casti! His was a troubled and restless spirit. Not content with his retirement at Calahorra, he proceeded to Madrid, where he spent his time intriguing for place. He succeeded, and rose step by step, until he became secretary of the Inquisition at Madrid, an office which he held from 1790 to 1792. Having been guilty of a grievous betrayal of the confidence reposed in him by the Inquisitor general, and of several other irregularities of conduct, he was ordered to leave Madrid, and to repair to his native place.

Here he was equally restless and intriguing. Detected by the Spanish government in a secret correspondence with the emissaries of the French republic in 1793, and suspected of other misdemeanors, he was arrested, and sent by the Inquisition, not into a dungeon, but merely into a retired convent of the Recollects at some distance from Calahorra, to compose his restless spirit and to do penance for his sins. Among his writings which were seized, several were found against the Spanish government, against the Holy See, and against the Inquisition. And yet, strange cruelty of the bloody Inquisition! upon his writing letters full of repentance and abject submis-

* El matrimonio a desgusto.

sion, he was released from his place of retreat, and again received into favor. He now made his appearance at court, and pushed his fortunes more rapidly than ever. By the aid of powerful friends, he was soon created canon of Toledo, and received the cross of the order of Charles III. At the court of Ferdinand VII, he was loaded with honors, and yet, on the first invasion of the French, he sought out Murat, their commander in chief, turned traitor to his country, and ranged himself on the side of her enemies. He repaired to Bayonne to pay his court to the new king, Joseph Buonaparte, took the oath of fidelity to him, and was appointed one of his secret counsellors. He now gave himself up entirely to politics: abandoning every ecclesiastical function, some say, even doffing the ecclesiastical habit.

Charged by Joseph Buonaparte with a commission for the suppression of the convents in Spain, he discharged his office with *singular* zeal and efficiency. In 1809, he was ordered by Joseph to write a history of the Spanish Inquisition, and he was *well paid* for his labor. He knew well what kind of a work would suit the palate of his royal master, and what kind of a work he was *expected* to write. He set about his task with great zeal; but owing to the expulsion of the French from Spain, and to other causes he was not able to complete it until nine years later. He fled to Paris, with his royal patron, and after having taken temporary shelter in England, he returned to Paris, after the treaty of Vienna, in 1815.

Nothing shows more fully his restless ambition, his total want of principle, than the course which he now adopted. Finding that the sun of the Buonaparte family had set forever, he determined again to pay his court to that Ferdinand whom he had abandoned and betrayed! He employed his usual weapon of low adulation: wrote a genealogical table of the royal family, and addressed letters full of flattery to the king and to the chapter of Toledo. But all was unavailing: his letters remained unnoticed. Then it was that he gave way to all the bitterness of his spirit. He thus wrote his portraits of the popes, full of invective and misrepresentation. When accused of gallantry with a French countess, at the age of sixty-six, his friends defended him on the ground that he had previously married her, though he was a priest who had vowed celibacy! He was finally banished from France, by the French government, for improper conduct,* and died shortly after at Madrid, February 25th, 1823, in the sixty-seventh year of his age. Had the Spanish government and the Inquisition been such as he had represented them, he would not perhaps have been permitted to re-enter Spain, and to terminate his life peacefully in his own country.

Such was Llorente, a traitor to his country, and probably to his religion; who tried to play off, in Spanish affairs, the same part that Talleyrand did in those of France, but failed for want of *his* genius. He was in Spain the counterpart of Fra Paolo in Italy, and of Courayer and Du Pin in France. Could we expect an impartial history of the Spanish Inquisition from such a man? He alters texts to suit his own purposes, and gives us only his own word for most of his statements. To show how little his assertions are to be relied on, in a pamphlet published at Paris in 1818, he boldly asserted that, between the years 1700 and 1808, the Spanish Inquisition had immolated at the stake no less than fifteen hundred and seventy-eight victims. This is not only a gross exaggeration, but a manifest misstatement.† Since the accession of the house of Bourbon to the Spanish throne in 1709, it would be difficult to prove that *one* victim was so immolated, or suffered capital punishment in any other way, through the agency of the Inquisition; and neither Llorente nor any other man has furnished proofs to the contrary. During this period, and for a long time previous, the chief inmates of the In-

* The writer of his life, prefixed to his "History of the Inquisition," ascribes his banishment from France to the persecution of the French clergy. Mr. Prescott hints at the same cause. But we think that the true cause is to be found in his own restless ambition, and the jealousy of the French government.

† Mr. Prescott detects many gross historical inaccuracies in Llorente, unconnected with the Inquisition, in painting which, according to him, he was never at fault! See Prescott, vol. i, *p.* 250, *note*; vol. ii, *p.* 108, *note*.

quisition were state prisoners guilty of high political misdemeanors, who had either accused themselves of imaginary crimes against religion, to avoid the greater rigors of the civil courts, or had been sent there by the Spanish government in order to prevent the *eclat* of a public trial. The terrible Inquisition thus became little more, under the Bourbon dynasty in Spain, than a department of the police.

Among the writers who have defended the Spanish Inquisition, besides the Abbé De Vayrac mentioned above, Count De Maistre,* and La Cordaire,† are the most distinguished. The works of both these conspicuous men are already before the American public, and it is unnecessary to offer much comment on them. La Cordaire devotes two chapters of his work to the Inquisition, of which he treats only in its connection with his main subject, the defence of the order of St. Dominic. He adduces few facts or arguments, which had not been already ably handled by De Maistre, whose work has been considered by many as the best which has ever appeared on the subject. Its chief fault is its brevity. We rise from its perusal with a desire to know more. Perhaps too, the author has indulged rather too much in philosophic speculation, and has advanced some principles for the defence of the odious tribunal, which its enemies would scarcely admit. Had he been less apparently solicitous to defend every thing connected with the Inquisition, and had he given up certain things, which are wholly indefensible, his work would have carried with it a greater appearance of candor and plausibility. Catholicity never can be injured by the truth. There is also occasionally a certain vagueness, and something that savors of inconsistency. Thus, for example, in his last letter, he says, "*The tribunal of the Inquisition is purely royal,*" and yet a little farther on, he remarks, quoting from the report of the Cortes: "*These tribunals* (of the Inquisition) *are thus at once ecclesiastical and royal,*" &c. He meant to say what the truth of history warrants, that of the two tribunals of the Inquisition the royal is predominant, and generally paramount in its authority; but it would have been better to have been more explicit. With these defects, the work of De Maistre is still excellent, and no one can peruse it without thinking better of the Inquisition.

The best compendious view of the subject which we have ever seen, is an essay by John Murphy, inserted in a late work published by him, in London.* But a full, fair, and extensive history of the Inquisition—one that might by its learning serve as an antidote to those of Limborch and Llorente, is still a *desideratum* in our Catholic literature. It requires the extensive learning and patient research of a Dr. Lingard, or a Dr. Wiseman, to dispel the clouds which have hung around that tribunal for centuries, and to present to the world, in the terse and condensed style of the one, or the copious and luminous details of the other, such a history as the importance of the subject demands.

Yet enough has been already published to enable us to detect many of the inaccuracies of Mr. Prescott, in his history of the "Modern Inquisition" in Spain. To attempt to review all of his statements in detail, would swell this article to an unwarrantable length; we will confine ourselves to certain general erroneous views, which pervade the entire history, cover the whole ground of the controversy, and include the minor inaccuracies. We have already endeavored to trace the sources of these errors in the authors whom he has chiefly followed.

Mr. Prescott views the Inquisition as a religious, and not as a political institution;† ascribes its establishment, notwithstanding the repugnance of Isabella, to the importunities of the clergy,‡ and the fanaticism of the people, demanding the sacrifice of the Jews, through selfish motives and religious

* In his "Letters on the Spanish Inquisition," republished with the excellent notes and illustrations of Dr. Fletcher, in the Religious Cabinet, i. e. the first volume of this Magazine.

† "Apology for the order of St. Dominic," 18mo, *p.* 143.

* "A compendium of modern geography, 1 vol. 8vo, *p.* 398.

† Vol. 1, *p.* 245, *note.* At least he asserts this in regard to the Inquisition established in Castile.

‡ Vol. 1, *pp.* 249, 250, *et seq.*

hatred of that race;* and he more than intimates that the tribunal, with all its laws and proceedings was but a carrying out of the principles of the Catholic Church.† He presents‡ a very dark picture of its forms of trial, of the presumptive proofs of Judaism, of the various forms of tortures, and of the awful "*autos da fe*," giving only those details which were calculated to make the institution appear odious, and mixing up with his account of the original Inquisition established by Ferdinand and Isabella, many forms and abuses, which, if they ever existed at all, certainly belong to a much later period. To make the Catholic Church appear in a still more odious light in the whole matter,§ he says, that the Roman pontiff, Sixtus IV, was moved to the publication of his first bull regarding the Inquisition, in 1478, by "*the sources of wealth and influence which this measure opened to the court of Rome.*"

To these charges most of the others may be reduced. These are the shades; we will endeavor to exhibit some of the lights of the picture. The rest of this article will accordingly present very summary proofs of the three following propositions, which it will be seen are diametrically opposed to the assertions of Mr. Prescott. *Audi alteram partem.*

1. *The Spanish Inquisition was a political institution, and the result of extraordinary political circumstances.*

2. *Its cruelties have been greatly exaggerated.*

3. *The Catholic Church is not responsible for the institution itself, much less for its abuses, real or alleged.*

4. It requires but a slight acquaintance with Spanish history to be convinced of the fact, that the Inquisition in that country was an instrument of state policy, employed under circumstances of high political excitement. The causes, which led to its establishment had been steadily operating for nearly eight hundred years. In 711, the Saracens had invaded Spain, seized upon its finest provinces, driven the original inhabitants into the mountains of the Asturias, and fastened a galling foreign yoke upon the neck of a hitherto free people. But the Spaniards did not tamely submit to foreign oppression: with the stern unyielding perseverance which belongs to their national character, they maintained the unequal contest with the enemy which had overpowered them and crushed their liberties. From the council held by the fugitive Spanish chiefs in the cave of Cavadonga, in 711, to the conquest of Grenada in 1492, the great struggle for the mastery continued between the two races with but little intermission. Never was there a contest of so long a continuance, or which resulted in a political hatred so deep and abiding. It was a civil and a border war, between two races which could never amalgamate, because kept asunder by different religions, different temperaments, and different interests. The Spaniards were fighting for their liberties—for their firesides, and their altars: the Saracens sought to annihilate the one, and pollute and desecrate the other. All prisoners taken in war by the latter were sold into bondage in Morocco, and religious orders were established by the Christians, for the redemption of these captives. The war thus assumed a religious cast, and the military orders of St. Iago, of Calatrava, and Alcantara, were established among the Spaniards to keep up the crusade against the enemies of their country and of their religion.

Can we wonder that under all these circumstances, the Spaniards should have had a deadly political hatred of the Moors? Can we be surprised that when this great struggle was approaching its crisis in the brilliant reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, and when, for the first time, for 781 years the Spanish nation had a fair opportunity of shaking off the yoke, this political feeling should have increased to a fearful excitement? And that this excitement should have manifested itself in the establishment of a tribunal of great severity, to assist the government in ferreting out the Moors, and expelling them from the country? We are rather surprised, that so much moderation was evinced under circumstances so exciting. After the conquest of Grenada in 1492, the

* See *ibid. pp.* 243, 244, *et seq.*

† *Pp.* 245, 246, 248, and *passim* throughout the chapter.

‡ *P.* 255, *et seq.* § *P.* 248.

Moors were allowed the free exercise of their religion, and it was only after repeated rebellions, both in Grenada, and in different parts of the ancient Moorish kingdom of that name, that the Spanish government resorted to the extreme measure of leaving the Moors no alternative, but to embrace Christianity, or leave the country.* The bitter experience of nearly eight centuries had convinced the Spaniards that the name of a Moor was identified with that of traitor and enemy of his country.

Intercepted letters in cypher proved that, after the conquest of Grenada, the Moors were concerting with their brethren in Africa, measures for regaining their lost power in Spain. The Jews, who were very rich, were scattered all over Spain, and were intermarried with the most opulent Spanish families,† were also deeply engaged in these plots.‡ They were, if possible, more odious in Spain than the Moors themselves. They were, likewise, accused of other crimes of dreadful atrocity: of kidnapping Christian children,§ and selling them into bondage into Africa, and even of feasting on the flesh of infant Christian babes, at the celebration of their passover!‖ They had monopolized the trade of the country, and, by usury and extortion, had fattened on "the spoils of the Egyptians" (Christians), in Spain. As early as the year 1391, popular indignation against this unhappy people had burst forth into an insurrection, in which many of them were massacred. Other countries witnessed similar scenes about the same time.¶ The expulsion of the Jews from Spain, was demanded by the popular voice; but the government content with the same severe measures of precaution against them, resisted this appeal for nearly a hundred years, and it was only after the Jews were known to be leagued with the Moors for the subversion of Spanish liberty, and after they had been detected in writing a libel* on the Spanish government, that the edict for their banishment was published, and the tribunal of the Inquisition established to carry it into execution.

In order the better to understand this whole history, let us put a parallel case. Suppose the Indian tribes on our western frontier should invade one of our western states, should subdue the finest portion of it, and drive such of the original inhabitants, as had not fallen under the tomahawk and scalping knife, into remote and unproductive portions of the state. Suppose that they should establish a new government on the ruins of the old, and that a bloody border war should be carried on for centuries between them and the original inhabitants, and that these should at length succeed in regaining their lost territory. But to make the parallel complete, suppose that among the whites, a large and opulent party should be found leagued with the Indians, and employing every intrigue to maintain *their* usurpation, would any one be surprised if this party should become more odious than the Indians themselves? And if popular indignation should be enkindled against them, even before the conquest of the Indians, would it not be perfectly natural? But if the Indians, after having been subdued, should be suffered to remain in the country with all their national usages untouched, and should be expelled, only after repeated attempts on their part, to regain their lost dominion; would not this be viewed as an evidence of unwonted lenity? And, if even after this continued treachery, they should still be suffered to remain in the country, provided they would conform to the religion and usages of the whites, would we not consider it a clemency, astonishing even in this age of boasted refinement? For the whites

* Mr. Prescott admits this, but still labors to prove that the indiscreet zeal of Cardinal Ximenes led him to adopt such measures for proselyting the Moors of Grenada, as infringed the treaty made with them, and stimulated them to rebellion. Yet the facts he alleges scarcely prove this. Prescott, vol. ii, ch. 6.

† See report of Cortes.

‡ Mr. Prescott says, vol. i, *p.* 136, that they were accused "perhaps with reason," with having facilitated the first Saracenic invasion.

§ Similar charges were made against the Moors after the conquest of Grenada. See an interesting paragraph in Prescott, vol. i, *p.* 253.

‖ See Prescott, vol. ii, *p.* 136.

¶ See Prescott, vol. ii, *p.* 152; *note.* Was Frederic the Great, of Prussia, actuated by religious bigotry, in expelling the Jews, in the last century?

* Mr. Prescott mentions this fact, vol. i, *p.* 249. But why hide away in a note a fact which had so great an influence on the destiny of this miserable people?

expelled from their homes, substitute the Spaniards; for the Indians, substitute the Moors, and for the treacherous party among the whites, the Jews; and the case will apply to the condition of Spain, on the establishment of the Inquisition.

This was a merely religious tribunal, forsooth! The whole texture of its constitution was as political as was its origin. The king named the Inquisitor general, who, with the *approval of the king*, named the subordinate officers of the tribunal. The whole institution was under the entire control of the royal council, without the sanction of which it was powerless: while the king with his council could stay any prosecution, or crush any process at will. So manifest was it to the whole world, that this tribunal was a local political institution growing out of circumstances peculiar to Spain, and designed only for the Jews and Moors, that when subsequently the Spanish government, under Philip II, sought to establish it in Milan, the people revolted, exclaiming "*that it was tyranny to impose on a Christian city, a form of Inquisition designed for Moors and Jews.*"* And so intimately was it connected with Spanish politics, that the great Charles V, in a codicil to his will, recommended it specially to his son Philip II, as an institution "*upon which the safety of Spain depended.*"† In 1812, the famous convention of the Spanish cortes for drafting a new constitution, appointed a special committee to draw up a report on the Spanish Inquisition. The learned men who drew up that able report, were no doubt well acquainted with Spanish history and politics, and they are unexceptionable witnesses on another account—they were violently opposed to the Inquisition. Yet they assert that "*it was an institution demanded and established by the monarchs of Spain in difficult and extraordinary circumstances.*"‡ And M. Guizot, a famous historian, and though a Calvinist, the present prime minister of Catholic France, says "*that it was at first more political than religious, and destined to maintain order, rather than to defend the faith.*"*

2. Much more might be said on this branch of the subject, but we must hasten to the proofs of the second proposition, in which we will endeavor to show that Mr. Prescott has drawn too *dark* a picture of the Inquisition, of its forms of procedure, and of its abuses and cruelties. Our limits will allow only a bare statement of the facts: our readers will readily make the comments. Far be it from us to defend many abuses of that tribunal, which as we shall show, the Popes and the Church uniformly condemned. Under the circumstances of extraordinary excitement which gave rise to the Inquisition, it was natural to expect some unnecessary severity; and the authority of the famous Spanish historian Mariana, who details those acts of rigor, is thus easily explained. Again, when Philip II, about sixty years later, re-established the tribunal with renewed severity, we may look for many abuses. But these two periods of excitement were, thank heaven, of very short duration, and the severities then resorted to are not a fair criterion, whereby to judge of the general character of the Inquisition. At other times, many of its rigorous laws were often like some of the grotesque forms of jurisprudence adopted by the Venitian republic, a mere dead letter, retained on the statute book, *in terrorem*.

That the abuses of the Inquisition have been greatly exaggerated, we prove by the express words of that arch-enemy of the tribunal, Voltaire,† whose testimony Mr. Prescott cites with so much complacency, to prove that the wicked measures of princes have generally originated in the evil counsels of their confessors.‡ We prove it

* Limborch, Book i, ch. 27. † *Ibid*, B. i, ch. 30.
‡ They also declare that "no decree (of the Inquisition) could be published without the consent of the king." (Report Cortes in 1821).

* "Elle fut d'abord plus politique que religieuse et destinee a maintenir l'ordre plutot qu'a defendre la foi." Cours d'histoire moderne. Paris, vol. 5, Lect. 11.

† His words as given in the French "Dict. des Sciences," are remarkable. "Sans doute, qu'on a impute a un tribunal si justement deteste, des exces d'horreurs qu'il n'a pas tonjours commis: mais c'est etre mal adroit, que de s'elever contre l'Inquisition par des faits douteux, et plus encore, de chercher dans le mensonge de quoi ła rendre odieuse." And yet this is precisely what all the enemies of the Inquisition have done, and none more so than Voltaire.

‡ Vol. i, ch. 6, *p.* 246.

by another unexceptionable witness, Mons. Bourgoing, sent by the French republic in 1789, as minister plenipotentiary to Spain. He was violently opposed to the Inquisition, and yet he says,* "I will acknowledge, in order to give homage to truth, that the Inquisition might be cited in our days, as a model of equity." This avowal, however unpalatable to himself, and to his employers, was wrung from him, only by the stern evidence of truth. Our third witness is Philip Limborch, whose character we have given above. Out of a very long list of criminals condemned by the Spanish Inquisition, during a very long period, he admits that only fifteen men and four women were executed, and most of these for treason, witchcraft, sacrilege, or other crimes than heresy.† From this fact we draw two inferences: first, that the rigid laws of the Inquisition were very feebly executed; and secondly, that a very small proportion of the criminals were tried for heresy. The Roman pontiff, Clement X, in a bull published in 1672, enumerates the offences for which persons might be proceeded against by the Inquisition, and it is remarkable, that out of thirteen different classes of crimes only one is heresy.‡ If our readers be inclined to smile at the prominent place assigned to witchcraft, sorcery, &c., by the pontiff, we ask them only to remember the history of the Salem witchcraft.

Of the two courts of the Inquisition, the civil and the ecclesiastical, the latter was in fact strictly a court of equity. The motto on its banner, "mercy and justice," was indicative of its character. "Mercy" was first offered to the culprit, and if he would not accept it, he was delivered over to the "Justice" of the civil court; but even then, with great reluctance, and always with a recommendation to "Mercy."§ Before the accused was arrested at all by the Inquisition, it was necessary to have the sworn evidence of three different witnesses, each of whom was required to swear that he was actuated by no malice, and that he did not act in collusion with any other person.* And both the accusers, and the officers of the Inquisition were subject to excommunition, if they were guided by malice, or any other unworthy motive.† It was only after the deposition of the third witness, that the accused was summoned, when if he disproved the charges, he was released. If he failed to do so, he was still released, if he declared his repentance. If, after being released, he was again arraigned in the same manner as at first, and was convicted a second time, he was again pardoned on repentance.‡ It was only on the third conviction, by three different sets, each consisting of three witnesses, that he was finally delivered over to the civil court, to be judged for the offence.§

The chief motive for secrecy in the proceedings of the tribunal, was a wish that the civil court might gain no knowledge of the facts, until the ecclesiastical court had exhausted every expedient for reclaiming the delinquent. And so far was this secrecy

* "Picture of Spain," reviewed by the French "Journal des Debats," of Sept. 17, 1805. See La Cordaire's Apology, &c. *p.* 117.

† See Fletcher's notes to De Maistre's first letter, in Religious Cabinet for July.

‡ Bullarium Rom. T. vii, *p.* 185.

§ Some authors think, without any reason, that this was a mere form. Jurieu, the famous French Calvinist, in his "History of the Papacy," Tom. ii, ch. 6, admits the fact.

* Simancas Institutiones Catholicæ. Tit. xliv, *p.* 330, Edit. Romæ, 1575, 4to. This work had great authority among the early Inquisitors. The testimony of the several witnesses was carefully noted down, and diligently sifted, and if on being again called, as they often were in the progress of the examination, they did not confirm the previous statement in every particular, their testimony was set at nought. Nor was the previous record of their testimony again read to them, but they were left entirely to their memory. If, under this rigid scrutiny, they were detected in equivocation, self-contradiction or perjury, they were liable to imprisonment, and to other severe penalties. See Simancas, *p.* 333.

† Benedict X, in a special bull renewed these censures, and reserved the absolution from them to the Holy See.

‡ Even P. Limborch, cited by Fleury, admits that the criminal was twice pardoned, by the ecclesiastical court, on his repentance.

§ Some of the courts required only two, but the more general practice demanded three unexceptionable witnesses, for each conviction. True, witnesses of suspicious character were sometimes allowed to testify, but their testimony was received only for what it was worth, "*qualem qualem probationem*," as Simancas says. It might afford conjectural evidence, and might aid in eliciting something more conclusive, but of itself, never could cause the conviction of the accused. (Simancas, Tit. li, *p.* 419.) In fact, to condemn the accused, the clearest evidence, and the most unexceptionable testimony, were always required, "*probationes luce clariores requiruntur.*" (Simancas, Ibid. *p.* 418.)

carried, that there is no evidence to prove that when the criminal was handed over to the secular court, the evidence elicited before the ecclesiastical tribunal was even so much as communicated to his prejudice. A trial altogether new seems then to have commenced before the civil court, and it was only at this stage of the prosecution, that the cruel practice of torturing the accused was resorted to. Ecclesiastics were not concerned in the infliction of punishment: it was contrary to the spirit of their order, and to the express laws of the Inquisition itself.* So that Mr. Prescott's frightful picture of the clergy applying the torture to their victims, is at best but a fancy sketch.†

The practice of torturing the accused in certain cases, was then almost universal in the jurisprudence of all nations. It was a part of the civil law, was embodied in the Theodosian and Justinian codes, and had the sanction of Ulpian, and other distinguished expounders of these codes. It had been borrowed from the old Roman jurisprudence. The Church did much to mitigate this, and many other odious features of the civil law, and many distinguished men, such as Ludovicus Vives, condemned the whole practice, as cruel and unjust. (Simancas, Tit. lxv. *p.* 495, *et seq.*) Tortures were employed by the civil courts of the Inquisition, only in extreme cases, and then more to prompt the repentance, than to bring about the condemnation of the accused. (Simancas, Tit. lxv. *p.* 496.) The confession elicited under torture, could not be used against the accused, unless he voluntarily confirmed it three days afterwards, according to the usage of the Spanish courts. (Ibid, *p.* 509.) If he would not confess, he was generally acquitted. (Ibid, *p.* 510.)

The application of the torture was restricted within very narrow limits, and all abuses in inflicting it were severely condemned, and subjected the officers thus transcending their powers, to the obligation in the forum of conscience, as well as in that of the public courts, of repairing all injury done to those thus tortured.* (Ibid, *p.* 497.)

In one word the ecclesiastical court of the Inquisition was but preparatory. The final decision of the case always took place before the civil court, which alone inflicted the punishments ordained by the Spanish laws. The former court had only to decide whether there was sufficient reason to have the accused indicted before the latter. It performed very much the same office as our modern grand juries, with these important differences, that it took cognizance only of a certain class of offences connected with religion, pardoned twice whenever the criminal gave satisfactory signs of repentance, and never *presented* but when there was no hope of reforming the offender. Where will you find any civil court thus lenient?† It is a thing unheard of in modern judicial proceedings; and yet the Inquisition is to be held up to scorn as the most cruel of all tribunals! Count Pollnitz, in his very interesting memoirs,‡ is astonished at the ideas Protestants entertain on a subject about which they know so little. "For my part, I own to you I cannot imagine in what the barbarity consists, which you Protestants attribute to the Inquisition. On the contrary it is, in my opinion, the mildest and most lenient tribunal that exists." And he assigns the same reason that we do above, appeals to his own observation in Catholic countries, and hints

* The maxim "*Ecclesia abhorret a sanguine,*" "The Church abhors bloodshed," is a standing principle of the canon law, by which the clergy were specially bound. So far was this maxim carried that clergymen were forbidden to practise surgery, or even to bleed a patient, and the children of butchers were irregular, and could not be ordained, without special dispensation. And yet, in the face of this evidence, the Catholic clergy must still be represented as thristing for blood!

† In fact he confounds the proceedings of the two courts throughout, barely remarking in a note on page 255, that Ferdinand had established a supreme council to supervise the proceedings of the subordinate tribunals. Why this important omission?

* For an account of the instruments of torture employed against the Catholics of England under Elizabeth and her successors, for more than one hundred years, see Lingard's England—Elizabeth, Butler's Book of the Catholic Church, Cobbett's Letters, &c. England was the last country in Europe to abolish the barbarous custom of burning at the stake, an instance of which occurred as late as the ninth year of George II. And yet *Englishmen dare* talk of the cruelties of the Spanish Inquisition!

† So equitable was the ancient Inquisition, that the order of the Templars in the beginning of the fourteenth century, sought to be judged by it in preference to any other court.

‡ Pollnitz's "Memoirs," volume iii, quoted in Fletcher's notes to De Maistre. Religious Cabinet. February.

at the opposite spirit of the Calvinistic consistory of Geneva. This was in fact an Inquisition which *never* forgave; and the English court of high commission prosecuted the inoffensive Catholic with a rigor that never relented, no matter how much the victim cried out for mercy! Even Mr. Prescott allows that Elizabeth's Inquisition equalled in severity that established by Ferdinand and Isabella.* The fact is, the former far outstripped the latter in every respect; and the English are the last people under the sun who should talk about the Spanish Inquisition!† And yet they precisely have raised the greatest clamor on the subject!!

It is not true that counsel was not allowed to the accused;‡ it is not true that the articles of accusation were not shown to him;§ it is not true that he had not proper means of defence allowed him. Finally, though the *autos da fe* were bad enough, yet the picture of them which represents the clergy assisting at them to enjoy the agony of the victims, is as unjust as it is fanciful. They attended to soothe, not to aggravate the sufferings of the condemned, as ministers of all denominations at the present day accompany the culprit to the scaffold. These are the principal erroneous charges against the Spanish Inquisition, many of which Mr. Prescott has revived. Most of the statements made above are founded upon the authority of a very valuable work published in Madrid, in 1736, by Michael Raphael de Macanag; but they can be substantiated even from the authors whom Mr. Prescott follows. When presenting a sketch of the form of trial by the Inquisition, why did he make so many important omissions? Why present even the few facts which he does give, with a coloring which indicates prejudice more worthy of the fierce religious acrimony of the sixteenth century, than of the present day of refinement and goodly feeling?

3. But the most mischievous part of Mr. Prescott's account of the Spanish Inquisition, is that in which he deliberately charges on the Catholic Church, not only the institution itself, but even its cruelties and abuses. Nothing could be more unjust. The Inquisition is connected with no doctrine of the Catholic Church, nor is it even a part of her discipline. It was never established in any country without the concurrence of its temporal rulers. In Spain the people and the Cortes demanded its establishment from the king as the *only* remedy to the desperate political evils of the country.* Ferdinand and Isabella, according to Limborch,† "*earnestly solicited the Roman pontiff*," to allow them to name inquisitors for their dominions. It is doubtful whether the pontiff, Sixtus IV, could have effectually resisted an appeal made with so much earnestness, and involving a matter so intimately interwoven with the welfare of Spain. He heard the petition, and issued the bulls demanded, in 1478; but, on the appeal of the Jews against the excessive severity of the inquisitors, he issued another bull in 1481, in which "he rebuked their intemperate zeal, and even threatened them with deprivation."‡ A little later, Pope Leo X received the petition of the Arragonese stating their grievances under the operation of the Inquisition, and granted the prayer thereof, by a special bull by which he greatly modified the form of the whole tribunal, and restrained the powers of the inquisitors; but to show how powerless the Pope was in this matter, the Emperor Charles V annulled the papal decree by his royal authority!§ But the Popes succeeded better in regard to Naples, over which they had more political influence; they steadily opposed the introduction of the Inquisition into that kingdom, and after a

* Prescott, vol. iii, p. 202.

† See Lingard's England, Elizabeth; Butler's "Book of the Catholic Church;" Cobbett's Letters, and De Maistre's fifth and sixth Letters, for proofs on this subject.

‡ Simancas, Tit. xliv. p. 332, from whose testimony it appears that, in the Spanish courts, counsel was not only allowed, but that he had unreserved communication with the accused for three days, in order, with his aid, to prepare suitable answers to the different charges of the indictment.

§ This is admitted by the writer of a most virulent article in the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, Article, Inquisition. Mr. Prescott admits it too, but with a qualification which destroys the force of the admission; vol. i, p. 257. See Simancas, Tit. xliv, p. 332, where this is asserted without any qualification.

* See Report of Cortes. † Limborch, b. i, ch. 24.
‡ Prescott, vol. i, p. 254. § Report of Cortes.

long struggle with the Spanish monarchs, gained the victory.* It was Charles V, and not the Pope, who established the Inquisition in Sicily.† It was the Senate of Venice, and not the Pope, that established the Inquisition in that republic.‡

The general policy of the Popes deprecated severity towards sinners and those who had wandered from the true faith. The Bullarium Romanum is full of proofs of this assertion. Our limits will allow but a few of the most prominent facts. As early as 1268 we find Pope Clement IV disapproving of the severe laws against blasphemy enacted by the sainted French monarch, Louis IX. Various Popes sought to protect the Jews from the insults and injuries to which they were liable from the populace, in various countries of Europe. Thus Honorius III, in 1217,§ published a bull in which he forbade, under the severest ecclesiastical penalties, any one to force them to be baptised against their will, or to offer any other indignity to their persons, or injury to their property.‖ And the Bull of Martin V, published in 1425,¶ in which they were declared liable to various penalties, if they persevered in buying and selling Christians, as they were accused of having done, did not, however, revoke the acts of his predecessors in favor of that obdurate race. As a proof of the clemency of the Roman pontiffs towards the Jewish people, there is a proverb current among them to this day, that "*Rome is the paradise of the Jews.*"

In regard to the Portuguese Inquisition the Popes maintained a long struggle with the Portuguese monarchs before they would at all consent to its establishment, and then they did so *with regret*, according to the testimony of Antonio Sousa, cited by Limborch.** And after it had been established, they did every thing in their power to mitigate its severity. Thus we find Clement X, in 1674-5, in three separate bulls,* receiving appeals from the decisions of the Portuguese tribunals, and threatening deprivation and other penalties to the inquisitors, if they persisted. And when these proved disobedient to the papal mandate, we find Innocent XI, the successor of Clement X, enforcing the decree of his predecessor against them (A. D. 1679), and declaring their acts null and void.† In another bull published in 1681,‡ the same pontiff corrects many abuses which had crept into the Inquisition of Portugal, and makes many salutary enactments for the guidance of the inquisitors. Among these one gives to the accused the privilege of selecting other counsel, if that assigned by the inquisitorial court be not agreeable to him, and directs that the new counsel have free access to his client; and another directs that the prisoners be treated with greater mildness, and that the prisons be less dark and the confinement less rigid. More evidence might be adduced to prove what we have above asserted, but we must stop here.§

In the face of all these facts, is it not very unjust, to charge the Popes, or the Catholic Church, with the abuses of the Inquisition? It is certain that they did every thing in their power to restrain the excesses of that tribunal, and if they frequently failed, it was the fault of temporal princes and of the times, not of the Church. One fact in regard to the Spanish Inquisition, would alone suffice to show how utterly unable the Pope, and even a general council of the Catholic Church was to reverse even one of its decisions! While the council of Trent was in session, Bartholomew Caranza, archbishop of Toledo, was arrested by the Inquisition and confined in prison on a charge of heresy. The interference of Pius IV, and the protest of the council of Trent, were unavailing; the Inquisition was inflexible, and the archbishop was released only after eight years, by order of Philip II.‖ If this

* Limborch, b. i, ch. 26.
† Id. b. i, ch. 27.
‡ See La Cordaire, p. 125.
§ Bullarium Rom. tom. iii, p. 191.
‖ Those who wish to see more on this interesting subject are referred to Guerra, Pontificiarum Constitutionum Epitome, vol. i, p. 191, *et seq.*, Edit Venitiis, 1772, 4 vols. folio.
¶ Bullarium Rom. tom. iii, p. 453.
** B. i, ch. 25.

* Bull. Rom. tom. vii, pp. 266, 271, and 312.
† Id. tom. viii, p. 96. ‡ Id. Ib. p. 230.
§ For more on this subject, see Guerra, p. 175, *et seq.* This author has, however, omitted to notice several papal bulls regarding the Inquisition.
‖ See La Cordaire, Apology, &c. pp. 133-4.

fact does not prove that the Church had no control over the Spanish Inquisition, we are at a loss to know what could prove that proposition!

Mr. Prescott* attributes perfidy and interested motives to the Roman pontiffs in their relations towards the Spanish Inquisition. No assertion could be more groundless. The Popes never derived any emolument from the inquisitorial tribunals, it was one of the standing rules of the "Supreme Roman Inquisition," established by a bull of Paul III, in 1542,† that its decisions should be given *gratis* in every case. In establishing this supreme court, the pontiff revoked all inquisitorial powers, and laid down such rules as were well calculated to prevent every abuse. And though three hundred years have elapsed since the establishment of this court, it has never pronounced sentence of capital punishment,—it is yet unsullied with blood!‡ The only thing for which it has ever been blamed, is its "very delicate" treatment of the great Galileo, when a clamor was raised against him by jealous rivals whom he had eclipsed.§ Such was the conduct of the Popes at home, where they had the power to act according to their own judgment, untrammelled by the political intrigues of princes!

The imbecile condition of Spain for the last century, has been ascribed to the Inquisition. If such be the case, how do we explain the fact that for two hundred years after its establishment, Spain was the first country in Europe? The decline of Spain may be traced with greater probability, to other causes. The emigration of her people to America, the influx of wealth from her colonies, and the consequent decline of industry among her population, combined with various other well known causes to lower her in the scale of European nations. We often hear of the number of victims who were immolated by her Inquisition, but we are not told of the far greater number who fell in the various religious wars by which Germany, France, and England were convulsed, while Spain was secured by this institution from the acrimonious controversy in which those wars originated!* Where the Spanish Inquisition immolated one victim, the moloch of religious dissension has immolated whole hecatombs!

We cannot think that Mr. Prescott would have hazarded many of the aspersions on the Catholic Church with which his book is filled, had he been fully aware of the facts above stated. He might have learned a lesson of moderation in this respect from his illustrious countrymen, Bancroft and Irving, especially as the Inquisition, the cause of his indignation, no longer exists. We regret still more the faults of his book, because it will descend to posterity as a standard work of American literature, of which his country may justly be proud. It is time for all of us to learn the lesson of forbearance taught by the Gospel, and confirmed by the bitter experience of the past! Have the Protestant sects been immaculate on the score of religious persecution, in regard to the mother Church, or even in regard to each other? If they have, then may they rail at the Spanish Inquisition! But if they have some misgivings on the subject, then would we say to them in the language of our blessed Lord to the Scribes and Pharisees who sought the death of the woman taken in adultery: "*He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone.*"

P. F.

* Vol. i, pp. 248 and 267.

† Bull. Rom. tom. iv, p. 211.

‡ See Bergier's Dict. de Theologie, Art. Inquisition, where he makes this same assertion, and challenges any one to produce a proof to the contrary; and yet no one has produced such proof.

§ See La Cordaire, Apology, p. 134, and Dublin Review for July, 1838.

* See Muzzarelli, "Il buon uso della logica," &c. vol. v, p. 108, for a beautiful passage on this subject.

PERPETUITY OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH ON THE HOLY EUCHARIST.*

IT is unfortunately true, and it has been a thousand times proved by experience, that individuals may deviate from the path of sound doctrine, and by following the wanderings of their imagination, fall into the abyss of error. But that the same should ever happen to the Church of Christ is absolutely impossible. It is impossible, for instance, that, if our Lord were not substantially present in the eucharist, and never taught the dogma of transubstantiation to his apostles, nor his apostles to the primitive Christians, that the Church should have ever been induced to admit these doctrines; and *vice versâ*, if these doctrines have been at any period believed by the whole Church, as they certainly were, *e. g.*, at the beginning of the pretended reformation, and also when Berengarius appeared towards the middle of the eleventh century, it is impossible that they should not have been always believed from the very origin of Christianity. Otherwise how could the Church be called "the pillar and ground of the truth?" (1 Tim. iii, 15.) How could it be said that "the gates of hell shall never prevail against her," nor shake her from the immovable rock upon which she was founded? (Matt. xvi, 18 and vii, 25.) How could "the Spirit of truth have abided with her forever" (John xiv, 16, 17), and Christ been with her "all days even to the consummation of the world?" (Matt. xxviii, 20.) In the Protestant system all these divine promises are but empty sounds without effect; and if so, we can no longer place implicit reliance on the words of Christ, and the whole of his religion must yield to the assaults of the deist and infidel! Who can admit a principle or supposition the consequences of which thus manifestly lead to the entire overthrow of Christianity itself?

Again, if the Christian Church, as our opponents assert, did not admit transubstantiation and the substantial presence of Christ in the eucharist during all the ages previous to the ninth or tenth century, it must have been because she could not reconcile herself to the idea of Christ's real body having been left us for the nourishment of our souls, though he himself had said: "The bread which I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world. . . . . For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." (John vi, 52, 56.) It must have been that these words appeared too hard as well to her as to many of our Lord's hearers, and that, instead of imitating those who said: "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life" (ib. 68), she preferred to say with others: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" (ib. 53.) But let it be well remembered by whom the latter words were uttered: they fell from the lips of the obstinate Jews, and of several inconstant and unhappy disciples who then abandoned Christ and walked no more with him (ib. 67). Will it be said, then, that the Church, during nine centuries, the first of her existence, involved herself in the fate of those unhappy men, and, by imitating their unbelief, had, like them, no part with our divine Saviour? Let those believe it, if they will, who are disposed to believe every thing, except that the Catholics are in the right; as for us, we cannot entertain an opinion so injurious at once to the Church of Christ, and to his providential care for the work of his hands.

Who, moreover, can better attest the antiquity and perpetuity of a doctrine, than the society by which it is universally revered and professed; particularly a society so venerable for its antiquity, so fruitful in learned and holy men, so invariably attached from principle to her doctrines and practices, as the Catholic Church most assuredly is? How forcible, likewise, must her testimony appear, when we see it confirmed by the testimony of those who are her adversaries on other points, viz., the

* A continuation of the review of the Book of Ratramn.

eastern sects of the schismatic Greeks, Armenians, Jacobites, Nestorians, who have now been separated from her for the space of eight, ten, or fourteen hundred years! In fact all these agree with her in referring their belief of transubstantiation, and of the real and substantial presence of Christ in the eucharist to the primitive times and to the very origin of Christianity. See their liturgies and other authentic documents, collected by the authors of *La Perpétuité de la Foi*, vol. i, b. v, xii; *Faith of Catholics* (Berrington), pp. 194—208. F. Lebrun, *Explication de la Messe*, vols. iii, iv, v, vi. *Lettres d'un docteur Catholique* (Scheffmacher), lettres vii and viii.*

What evidence shall we admit, if we may reject evidence like this? What fact shall we believe, if we do not believe a fact grounded upon such a constant and unanimous testimony of very many nations, differing from each other in language, laws, customs, &c., and what, in reality, could have united these various and separated churches in one common belief, except the identity of its origin, namely the faith of the primitive Church and the teaching of Christ (Matt. xxvi, Mark xiv, Luke xxii, John vi) and of his apostles. (*v. g.* 1 Cor. x, 16, and xi, 23—29.)

These considerations should surely suffice to demonstrate the perpetuity of the

* Of these numerous and valuable documents we shall adduce only three, as quite sufficient for our present purpose. In a synod celebrated by the Syriac Church in 1668, the following decrees were unanimously adopted. "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. 1. We firmly believe that the body and the blood of Christ are contained truly and really in the eucharist, and not in figure and virtue only, as some new heretics have fancied. 2. Likewise, that the bread and the wine are, in virtue of the divine consecration, really and substantially changed and converted, or what is the same, transubstantiated into the true body and blood of Christ. 3. That Christ truly residing in the eucharist is to be adored by the supreme worship called *of latria*, and is thus adored by all the faithful of our Church. 4. That in the sacred liturgy a true and real propitiatory sacrifice is offered to God for the living and the dead. This is and *has always been* the belief of our Churches; having received it from our ancestors, we preserve it and shall preserve it; *nor is there amongst us mention made and remembrance kept of any one having ever taught otherwise.* This we do testify, on the twenty-ninth of February, 1668." Here follow the subscriptions of twelve bishops or priests.

The attestation given, to the same effect, by the Nestorians of Diarbekir in Mesopotamia, is not less explicit, nor less remarkable. Having been informed that there were in France some persons (the Huguenots) who denied the real presence and transubstantiation, and that a French author (Minister Claude) attributed the same unbelief to the eastern Christians, they indignantly repelled the charge, calling it a blasphemy and an odious imposture, and sent to France the following protest, the original of which was deposited in the abbey of St. Germain-des-Pres at Paris:

"We, the metropolitan and priests of the Nestorian Church in the city of Diarbekir, have learned with very great surprise, that a certain son of Satan in France has dared offer an atrocious insult to the oriental Church, by falsely asserting that we do not believe and receive the very great mystery of the sacred oblation. In order, then, to dispel the doubt which that evil spirit has attempted to throw into the minds of men, we say, we do testify and declare to all that shall read this protest, that the faith and doctrine of the whole eastern Church, which she holds and professes in regard to this holy mystery, the eucharist, *is the faith and doctrine of the Gospel, the very same which has been received without any interruption from the earliest antiquity to the present day, in all the Churches of the east.* Christ has said that he gave us his body, the same which was to be delivered for us; and he who says that Christ gives us only bread and wine as a sign and a figure of his body and blood, is not a Christian. We firmly believe that after the words of our Lord, which the priest pronounces by divine authority, the substance of the bread is changed into the substance of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that the substance of the wine is changed into the substance of his precious blood; so that there remains nothing of the bread and wine except the accidents of both. We offer that sacred body crucified for us, and that blood shed for many and for us, that is to say, for the living and the dead, for the remission of their sins, and of the punishments which they have deserved. We anathematize those who say the contrary and who do not receive this doctrine. Given in the year of our Lord, 1669, on the 24th of Nisan."

A question having been proposed to an Armenian patriarch on the same subject, and about the same time, he gave the following answer: "We have heard that it has been asserted by some persons that the eastern Christians (those excepted who are united with the Roman see) do not believe the most holy sacrament of the eucharist to be the true body of Christ, and we wonder at the folly and boldness of these persons, who thus presume to speak of what they do not know. For all the eastern Christians of this time believe with unshaken and unhesitating faith, that in the sacrifice of the Mass, the bread is truly changed into the body, and the wine into the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; even *they never had any doubt about it*, and *never yielded to that infidelity* which is now professed by some nominal Christians. We, therefore, do assure you that we Armenians have received from our ancient patriarchs and have kept from the time of the council of Nice (the epoch of their conversion to Christianity) till the present time, this article of faith; having, moreover, the following invocation in our liturgy, besides the words of consecration: "*Almighty Father, send down thy Holy Spirit, and by his co-operation change this bread into the body, and this wine into the blood of our Lord, God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.*" This declaration is signed by the patriarch and by an Armenian doctor, who seems to have been the companion of his travels.

Catholic faith on the holy eucharist; yet, as particular evidences commonly produce a greater impression on the mind than general arguments, we shall now proceed, *ad superabundantiam juris*, to show the truth of our assertion—1. by adducing the words of the ancient fathers and councils, especially those passages which not only imply the real and substantial presence of Christ in the eucharist, but also directly establish the dogma of transubstantiation; 2. by showing the absolute impossibility of any innovation having ever taken place in the faith of the Church relative to this sacred mystery.

We have first the words of *St. Ignatius*, disciple of St. John the Apostle and bishop of Antioch, who, speaking of certain heretics of his time, says: "They abstain fmor the eucharist because they do not acknowledge it to be *the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins*, and which the Father by his goodness resuscitated." (*Ep. ad Smyrn.*)

St. Justin, a Christian philosopher, and martyr in the persecution of Marcus Aurelius: "As Jesus Christ, our Saviour, made man by the word of God, *took flesh and blood for our salvation;* in the same manner, we have been taught, that the food which has been blessed by the prayer of the words that he spoke, and by which our blood and flesh in the change are nourished, *is the flesh and blood of that Jesus incarnate.*" (*Apol.* 2, *ad Imper. Anton.*)

St. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, who suffered martyrdom under Severus, in 202: "When the mingled chalice and the broken bread receive the word of God, they become the eucharist, *which is the body and blood of Christ.*" (*Advers. hæres.* l. v.)

St. Hilary, bishop of Poitiers: "Of the natural verity of Christ in us, whatever we speak, we speak foolishly and wickedly, unless we learn of him; for it is he that said, *my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.* There is no place to doubt of the truth of Christ's flesh and blood: for now, by the profession of the Lord himself, and according to our belief, *it is truly flesh, and truly blood.* (*De Trin.* l. viii.)

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his catechetical instructions addressed to the neophytes, or persons newly baptized: "The bread and wine, which before the invocation of the adorable trinity, were nothing but bread and wine, become, after this invocation, the body and blood of Christ. The eucharistic bread, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, *is no longer common bread, but the body of Christ.* Jesus Christ, in Cana of Galilee, once changed water into wine by his will only; and shall we think him less worthy of credit, *when he changes wine into blood.* . . . Judge not of the thing by your taste, but by faith assure yourself, without the least doubt, that you are honored with the body and blood of Christ; this knowing, and of this being assured, that *what appears to be bread, is not bread, though it be taken for the bread by the taste, but is the body of Christ, and that what appears to be wine, is not wine, though the taste will have it so, but the blood of Christ.*" (Catech. Mystag. iv.) In this passage of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, we have almost as many proofs against the Protestant system, as there are not only sentences, but even words. What Catholic of the present day could express the dogma of transubstantiation better than this learned and holy doctor of the fourth century did, in explaining to the neophytes the Christian doctrine on the subject of the eucharist?

St. Basil the Great, archbishop of Cæsarea: "About the things that God has spoken, there should be no hesitation nor doubt, but a firm persuasion that all is true and possible. With what fear, with what affection, with what conviction of mind, should we partake of the body and blood of Christ? The apostle teaches us to fear when he says: He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself. (1 Cor. xi, 29.) While the words of the Lord: This is my body, which shall be delivered for you, (Ibid. 26,) create a firm conviction." (*Regul.* viii, *and* lxxx.)

St. Gregory, bishop of Nyssa, called the Father of Fathers by the second general council, A. D. 381: "By the word of God and prayer, *the bread is instantly changed into the body of Christ*, agreeably to what he said, *this is my body.*" (*Orat. Catech. c.* 37.)

St. Ambrose, archbishop of Milan: "Light is preferable to the shadow, truth to figure,

the body of Christ to the manna of heaven. But you may say, I see somewhat else; how do you assert that I shall receive the body of Christ? This remains to be proved. How many examples may we not make use of to show, that we have not here what nature formed, but what the divine blessing has consecrated, and that the virtue of this blessing is more powerful than that of nature; because by it nature itself is changed! Moses held the rod; he cast it on the ground, and it became a serpent." He proceeds to instance many other miraculous changes, as recorded in Scripture, and then adds: "*If now the blessing of men was powerful enough to change nature, what must we not say of the divine consecration,* when the very words of our Lord are the agent!" And again: "You have read concerning the creation of the world: *He spoke, and it was done; he commanded, and it was formed.* (Psalm cxlviii, 5.) Will not the word of Christ, therefore, which could draw out of nothing what was not, *be able to change the things that are, into that which they were not?* Our Lord himself proclaims: *This is my body.*" (*De Mysteriis, c.* ix.)

The words of *St. John Chrysostom* are not less remarkable: "Let us," says he, "believe God in every thing, and not gainsay him, although what is said may seem contrary to our reason and our sight. Let his word overpower both. How many persons are heard to say: I would like to behold his form, his shape, his attire! But thou dost see him, thou touchest him, thou receivest him into thy breast. These are not the effects of human power. He who in that supper did these things himself, now also does them for you. We hold the order of ministers, *but the sanctifier and changer of them is himself.*" (Homil. 83 in Matt.) Again: "It is Christ who makes the things lying on the altar become his body and blood. The priest stands performing his office, and pronouncing the words, but the power and grace are the power and grace of God. He says, *this is my body, and these words effect the change of the things offered.*" (*Homil.* i, *de Prodit Judæ.*)

After reading such explicit testimonies, it might be a curious thing to know how Protestants reconcile their doctrine with that of these illustrious Fathers.

St. Augustine, the great bishop of Hippo, writes thus: "Christ took upon him earth from the earth, because flesh is from the earth, and his flesh is from the flesh of Mary, and because he here walked in this flesh, *even this same flesh he gave us to eat for our salvation.* But no one eateth this flesh without having first adored it, and not only do we not sin by adoring, we rather sin by not adoring it." (*In Psalm,* xcviii.)

St. Nilus, a priest and monk of Sina, is equally explicit: "Before the prayer of the priest," says he, "and the coming of the Holy Spirit, the things laid on the table are common bread and wine; but, after the solemn invocations, and the descent of the adorable spirit, *it is no longer bread, and no longer wine, but it is the body and the pure and precious blood of Christ,* the God of all." (*L. I. Ep.* xliv.)

St. Gregory the Great, pope, who died in 604, speaking of our Lord in the character of the good shepherd, says: "That good shepherd laid down his life for his sheep, *that he might change our sacrament into his body and blood,* and feed with the aliment of his flesh the sheep which he had redeemed." (*Homil.* xiv, *in Evang.*)

Venerable Bede has given a full and unequivocal testimony of the same doctrine, "When we celebrate the Mass," says he, "we again immolate to the Father *the sacred body and the precious blood of the Lamb,* with which we have been redeemed from our sins." (*Homil. in Vig. Pasch.*)

We will close this series of quotations from the Holy Fathers who lived in the first eight ages of the Church, with these words of St. John Damascene, whose death occurred about the year 780: "You ask how does the bread become the body, and the wine mixed with some water the blood of Christ; I answer, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, who can do much more than we can understand. *As the bread which we eat, and the wine and water which we drink are naturally changed into our body and blood; so the bread and the wine laid on the altar are, by the invocation and coming of the Holy Ghost, miraculously changed into the body and*

blood of Christ." (*De Fide Orthod. l. iv. c.* 14.)

In these passages, to which many more might be added, the reader will find many invincible proofs of the Catholic dogma, of *Christ's real and substantial presence* in the eucharist, and of *transubstantiation*. No mention is made here of a presence merely in sign, figure or virtue; on the contrary, all this is positively excluded by the Fathers. According to them, as well as to modern Catholics, *we ought not to dispute against the word of God, nor trust to our reason and senses; after the consecration, there are no longer bread and wine in the eucharist, although they seem to remain; the bread has been changed into the body, and the wine into the blood of Christ; the same flesh is present on the altar, which was taken from the B. Virgin, which suffered for us,* &c. and the reality of these wonders *does not admit of the slightest doubt, when we consider the texts of the Gospel, and of St. Paul, and the prodigies wrought by the Omnipotence of God, the creation, the incarnation, the change of water into wine in Cana of Galilee, and other miraculous changes recorded in the Scripture.* Could they possibly have expressed themselves on the real presence and transubstantiation in plainer and stronger terms? Had they, fourteen or sixteen hundred years ago, foreseen the Protestant doctrine on this point, could they have refuted it more effectually than they did? and would not the man who should attempt to pervert their meaning, be equally justifiable in producing the words of the council of Trent, and of our catechisms, and with a shameless disregard of truth, declare that they do not mean any such thing as real presence and transubstantiation?

It must, moreover be observed, that the doctrine of the Holy Fathers was no other than that of the Church during the ages in which they lived. It is evident that they proposed it as such to their hearers and readers, since they either spoke of it as a notorious fact (*v. g.* St. Justin, St. Augustine, venerable Bede), or made it the subject of their catechetical instructions (St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Ambrose), or expatiated upon it with delight in their homilies and solemn discourses, to increase the piety and devotion of the faithful towards this sacred mystery, (St. Gregory the Great, St. Basil, St. John Chrysostom), or made use of it as an unquestionable principle to guard the Churches against the error of the Gnostics, who denied that Christ had taken a real body in the incarnation, (St. Ignatius, St. Irenæus), or, in fine, numbered it in their didactic letters and treatises among the principal tenets of the Christian faith (St. Nilus, St. John Damascene, St. Hilary). Hence these instructions of the Fathers, whether first delivered by word of mouth, or published in their writings, (instead of meeting with any opposition, as would have been the case, had they savored of novelty) were every where received with the greatest respect and veneration, as containing the pure belief of the Church from the time of the apostles. Hence too was their doctrine, whenever the occasion required, solemnly sanctioned by the acts and decrees of general councils. The council of Ephesus, for instance, in 431, approved the following dogmatical decision already passed against the Nestorian heresy, by the illustrious patriarch St. Cyril, and the provincial council of Alexandria: "We offer in the Churches the holy, vivifying and unbloody sacrifice; receiving the body which is presented to us, and likewise the precious blood, not as of a mere ordinary man, but *as having been made the proper body and blood of the Divine Word.*" (*Concil. Ephes. Act.* 1.) The second council of Nice, also, at which three hundred and fifty bishops were present, made this solemn declaration (A. D. 787): "Never has it been said by our Lord, or by the Apostles, or by the Fathers, that the unbloody sacrifice offered by the priests, is only an image of Christ, but *they have called it his true body and blood.* The elements have indeed the name of antitypes, before they are sanctified; *but, after the consecration, they are called, they are believed to be, and they really are the body and the blood of Christ.*" (*Conc. Nic.* ii, *Act.* 6.)

It is, therefore, as plain as the light of day, that the whole Church, from her very origin, constantly believed, professed and taught the dogma of *transubstantiation*, and

of *the true, real and substantial* presence of Christ in the eucharist. The sincere inquirer cannot but witness with indignation the confident assurance and bold assertion of the publishers of Ratramn's work, when they tell us, that this dogma was unknown in the Catholic Church in primitive times, and before the ninth century, and that Paschasius Radbertus at that period was the first who propounded the doctrine of transubstantiation. Nor do we see how the translator of the book can escape the imputation of gross ignorance or insincerity, when he says: "Bellarmine against all authority, and without a shadow of proof, asserts that Ratramn was the innovator and Paschasius the defender of the Catholic doctrine, when the fact is the very reverse," (*Pref. p.* 15;) as if Bellarmine had not devoted thirty-four chapters, replete with erudition and powerful arguments (thirty-three of his second book, and the twentieth of his third book *De Sacramento Euchar.*) to demonstrate what the translator here denies, or as if all his arguments were vain because he did not think proper to insert in his small volume *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, the fifty or sixty folio pages of his controversies written thirty years befo[illegible]! As to Bishop Whittingham, we can only regret the imprudence that led him to denounce the notion of transubstantiation as *heretical* (*Page* v, *of the little vol. first of the Preface*), when the charge so evidently attaches to his own opinion and assertion.*

But our arguments do not end here. As Bishop Whittingham seems to find a peculiar satisfaction in speaking of the doctrine held in the ninth century and subsequently, we must also put him right on this point. It will be an easy task to do so, as, independently of various other evidences, the books alone of Paschasius Radbertus would

* It is scarcely requisite to say any thing against a certain article written on the same subject, in number two of the Episcopal *True Catholic, Reformed Protestant and free*; that is, the Baltimore monthly of *the true Catholic* or *universally established* Episcopal Church!—yet *reformed* and separated from the only Catholic society that exists upon earth;—*Protestant*, i. e. protesting against that society, *and* protesting so bravely as to be *free* from all just claims to catholicity. The author of this article having derived his main view of Ratramn's book from the remarks of its publishers, must naturally be involved with them in the same defeat, and in the same guilt, of having advanced unjustifiable charges and misstatements. However, as the article contains some peculiarities of doctrine and language, it may not be amiss to make them the subject of a few remarks.

While the gentleman accuses (*P.* 67, note p.) *some of the modern Roman controversialists of ignorance or falsehood*, he affords himself a striking instance, we do not say of *falsehood*, but surely of *ignorance*. 1st, in stating (*P.* 67,) against all historical evidence, that *nothing like the theory of Paschasius is found in any previous writer, or ancient father, or liturgy*, and ridiculously endeavoring to make Bellarmine appear of the same opinion. 2d, in asserting (*P.* 68,) that several writers undertook to refute Paschasius on the subject of transubstantiation, whereas the case, as shall very soon be proved, was just the reverse, if we except Scotus Erigena, a man of low standing among his own cotemporaries, who left no followers, and whose book was condemned by the council of Vercelli, A. D. 1050. 3d, in quoting, as some of our best authors, Cajetan, Durand, Erasmus; men, at least these two last, of little repute as theologians, and, although not adverse to the doctrine of transubstantiation, better known amongst us for the singularity than for the accuracy of many of their opinions. 4th, in confounding the grammatical expression, with the religious doctrine of *transubstantiation*; (*P.* 67; *note.*) the former indeed, just as the words *trinity, incarnation, consubstantial*, is not found in the Scripture, and was only afterwards adopted by the Church against the opposite error; but as the mysteries of the Holy Trinity, the consubstantiality and incarnation of the son of God, are contained in the sacred writings, and were always believed by the Church, so also is, and has ever been the dogma of transubstantiation. 5th, in adopting with the Anglican Bishop Taylor, (*P.* 74; *note w.*) the words *really, substantially*, etc. without admitting the flesh and blood of Christ to be truly in the eucharist, which amounts to the same thing as to say, that Christ is *really and substantially present* in it, and yet that he is *really and substantially absent*. 6th, in supposing that these words *real, true*, and *substantial* body and blood of Christ, are the only ones by which we prove from the Fathers the eucharistic transubstantiation; (Ibid. 74,) whereas we have another and a more direct argument taken from those passages which distinctly express *the change of the bread into the body, and of the wine into the blood of Christ*, and which declare that *there are no longer bread and wine in the eucharist after the consecration*. 7th, in asserting (*P.* 67; *note*) that "in the interval between the Lateran council (Anno 1215,) and the council of Trent, (1545, 1563,) *many eminent Roman theologians* did not scruple to defend opinions contrary to transubstantiation," which is utterly false,—not one can be named. Of the three which are mentioned, *Occam* was a schismatic excommunicated by Pope John XXII: *Waldensis* spent his whole life in refuting the heretics of his time, who attacked transubstantiation; and *Peter Lombard, the famous master of the sentences*, although he could not define the manner in which this mystery is effected, positively asserts its reality in these words: "After the consecration there is no longer the substance of the bread and wine, although their appearances remain," (*Sentent. lib.* iv, *Dist.* 2.) 8th, in doubting (*P.* 63; *note* q.) the sentiment of Paschasius himself on this point, whereas Paschasius plainly says: "Although the form of the bread and wine is here, we ought to believe that there is, after the consecration, nothing else whatever than the body and blood of Christ;" (Ch. I, *lib. de Corp. et*

suffice to overthrow at once the Protestant notion in reference to those times. This truly eminent scholar and divine, well acquainted with the Greek and Hebrew languages, deeply versed in the knowledge of the Scripture and tradition, which served alike to supply him with arguments, and not less conspicuous for his piety and sanctity than for his learning, published about the year 831, his treatise on the eucharist, in which, after reminding his readers of the omnipotence of God, who can do all that he wills, he says: "We ought to believe that, after the consecration, what still appears to be bread and wine, is, however, nothing else than the body and blood of Christ. Of this, Truth itself assures us, saying: 'This is my flesh for the life of the world.' . . . . *No one* who believes the divine word, doubts the reality of the body and blood rendered present by the consecration of the mystery, as the same Truth has said: "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.'" (*De Verit. Corp. et Sang. Dom.* c. i, et iv.) The same doctrine he inculcates throughout his whole treatise, as also in his commentary on the twenty-sixth chapter of St. Matthew, and finally in his letter to Frudegardus, the expressions of which are peculiarly remarkable: "After the prayer of the canon at mass, in which the priest begs of the heavenly Father that the eucharistic elements *may become the body and blood of his most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ,* all the people [as was then the custom] with unanimous voice answer *amen;* and thus the whole Church, of every nation and language, after having offered her prayers, confesses that what she prays for, has taken place. Let the person then who might be more inclined to contradict than to believe, see what he is doing against the Lord himself, and against the whole Church of Christ. It is an enormous crime to pray with all, and not to believe what truth itself testifies, and what all Christians every where and unanimously confess to be true. Since he himself declares that it is his body and his blood, all doubt upon the subject must be dismissed." (*Epist. ad Frudegard.*)

Now, one of two things must be admitted; either what Paschasius repeatedly and publicly relates of the universal and unanimous belief of the Church in his time is incontestable, or Paschasius must have been insane thus to advance, in the face of the world, as notoriously true, what he knew to be notoriously false; and consequently he should have been considered as the most despicable and impertinent man that ever attempted to write on any subject. But, far from it, we find him, though a private religious, esteemed, praised, respected and honored, especially after the publication of his book on the eucharist, by learned men, by Catholic princes and prelates, particularly the French bishops, twenty of whom, in their council of Paris (A. D. 846), called him their *venerable brother,* "*venerabilem fratrem Radbertum,*" and readily confirmed at his request the privileges of the monastery of Corbey. His treatise was every where received with so much applause and read with such satisfaction that the author was induced to give a second edition of it, about thirteen years after its first publication. Instead of the multitude of adversaries which Protestant fancy has arrayed against it, not even one (except Scotus Erigena, whose writings were condemned by the Church) assailed the doctrine of Paschasius in relation to the real presence and transubstantiation. If a few, like Ratramn, disputed about some incidental questions, all agreed as to the substance of these essential dogmas.* We shall here adduce some passages from the

Sang. Dom.) 9th, in continuing to claim for his party the ancient Anglo-Saxon Church, notwithstanding (let the reader compare the proofs and the answer) the yet *unanswered* arguments of Dr. Lingard, "in that very unfair and disengenuous note of his work on the 294th page of the American edition," (*P.* 73.) 10th, in stating (*P.* 67; *note* p. *last lines,*) that Peter Lombard wrote *sixty years before the council of Trent.* Now Peter Lombard died in 1164, and the council of Trent was closed in December, 1563, which makes an interval of exactly four centuries. Here in a period of four hundred years, we find an anachronism of only three hundred and forty!! Gentle reader, be not inexorable.

* In addition to what has already been said on this subject in our preceding number, the reader may see all this extensively and satisfactorily proved in the learned *Preface* of Mabillon *on the second part of the fourth Benedictine century;* the author of *Perpetuite de la Foi,* vol. i, l. viii; Natalis Alexander, *in Histor. Eccles. sæculi* IX *et* X, *Dissert.* x—xv, vol. vi, pp. 338—371; and D. Ceillier, *Histoire des Auteurs Ecclesiast.,* vol. xix, pp. 87—146.

most prominent of these pretended adversaries.

1. "Who could believe that bread should be changed into flesh, and wine into blood, had not our Saviour himself said it,—He who created bread and wine, and made all things out of nothing? It is easier to make one thing out of another, than to create all things from nothing." (Rabanus Maurus, archbishop of Mentz, *De Sacris Ordinibus*, lib. vii, c. x.)

2. "Since, therefore, the Son of God himself has said; 'My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed,' we ought to understand that these same mysteries of our redemption are truly the body and blood of the Lord." (Walafridus Strabo, abbot of Richenou, *De Officiis Divinis*, c. xvii.)

3. "We believe that the inanimate nature of the bread and wine mixed with some water, is changed into the rational nature of the body and blood of Christ." (Amalarius, *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*, lib. iii, c. 24.)

4. "When the creature of bread and wine is, by the unspeakable operation of the Holy Ghost, changed into the body and blood of the Son of God, Christ is eaten. . . It is he himself who through the powerful benediction of the Divine Spirit, makes the elements become his sacred body and blood." (Florus, deacon of Lyons, *in Expositione Missæ.*)

5. "We believe and faithfully confess, that the substance of the bread and wine is, through the operation of the divine power, substantially converted into another substance, that is to say, the flesh and blood of Christ. . . . . In order to remove or diminish the repugnance and excessive awe which might otherwise possess us, Almighty God, accommodating himself to our infirmity, wishes the outward form of the bread and wine to remain in the eucharist, although it is in reality the body of Christ and his blood." (Haymon, bishop of Halberstadt, *Tract. de Corp. et Sang. Domini.*)

All these authors lived and wrote during the course of the ninth century; the following names will serve as witnesses for the tenth and eleventh centuries.

Ratherius, bishop of Verona, writes as follows: "Believe, dear brother, that just as in Cana of Galilee, water was made, by the command of God, true and not figurative wine,—so here wine, by the divine blessing, becomes true and not figurative blood, and bread becomes flesh. Although the color and the taste remain, believe that it is the real flesh and blood of the Lord, being assured of this mystery by Truth itself." (*Epist. ad Patric. Sacerd.*)

The belief of *St. Dunstan*, archbishop of Canterbury, and of the Anglo-Saxon Church is made manifest from what Osbertus relates of that holy prelate: "Having returned to the altar, he (St. Dunstan) changed by the immaculate benediction, the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. When the moment arrived to bless the people, wishing to address them again, he again withdrew from the altar, and being filled with the Spirit of God, he spoke so eloquently of the reality of Christ's body, of the future resurrection and eternal life, that one might have taken him for an inhabitant of the heavenly Jerusalem." (*Vit. Sti. Dunst.*)

St. Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, has the following words: "It is a crime to doubt whether He who created all things out of nothing, can, by the same omnipotence, change the earthly nature of the bread and wine into the substance of his body, since he says himself, 'this is my body, this is my blood.'" (*Epist. ad Adeodatum.*)

Lanfranc, the celebrated adversary of Berengarius, pressed him with this cogent argument, founded upon a notorious fact, which the innovator himself did not deny: "If *that* be true which you assert about the body of Christ, then must *that* be false which the Church every where believes and teaches on the same subject. For, all those who are and who glory in being Christians, glory likewise in receiving the true flesh and the true blood of Christ, both taken from the Virgin. Ask all those of the Latin tongue, ask the Greeks, the Armenians, in a word, the Christians of every nation; all unanimously testify that such is their belief. And now, if the belief of the universal Church be erroneous, either there never was a Catholic Church, or it has perished, since

there is nothing more effectual in producing the ruin of souls, than a pernicious error. But to assert that the Church either never was or has perished, is anti-catholic, anti-christian and a sacrilegious presumption. Therefore the error is on your side. Therefore, again, it is the true flesh of Christ which we eat, and his true blood which we drink." (*De Corp. et Sang. Dom.*, c. 22, 23.)

We might further adduce a vast number of similar testimonies, from Durand of Troarn, Hugh of Langres, Adelman of Brescia, Guitmond of Aversa, Alverus of Liege, etc.; also from the liturgies, used as well during those ages, as before and after, the Roman, Ambrosian, Alexandrian, Gallican, Gothic, etc., all of which mention the *substantial* presence of Christ in the eucharist, and the *change* of the eucharistic elements into his sacred body and blood: yet, we believe it quite unnecessary to carry our proofs any further, as no one, ever so little acquainted with ecclesiastical history, can deny that when Berengarius, in the middle of the eleventh century, began to preach a different doctrine, the whole Church so unanimously rose against him, that there was not a single town engaged in his party, and that he himself was repeatedly compelled to abjure his errors.* From that time forward, the notoriety of the belief of all Catholics spread throughout the world; the unanimous testimony of the eastern Churches; the decrees of the general councils of Lateran, Constance, Florence, and Trent, do not admit even of a cavil, and, in addition to the preceding uninterrupted series of authorities from the ancient fathers, doctors, and councils, they *establish conclusively the fact*, that the doctrine of the real presence and transubstantiation has been, from the primitive ages and in accordance with the words of Christ and the preaching of the apostles, constantly believed, professed and taught by the Catholic Church.

With this massive and overwhelming evidence before us, what can be said of the Book of Ratramn (including the homily of Ælfric mostly taken from it), except that its contents are a mere drop of water added to a large river, if conformable to the Catholic doctrine; and if contrary to it, a mere straw cast into an immense and consuming fire? If it be asked, why, in this last supposition was it not condemned by the Church at that time, we will answer that it was not for many very good reasons. 1. Because a bare supposition is no proof of guilt; 2. because the little treatise does not appear to have produced any impression among the cotemporaries of the author; 3. because it was scarcely known to them, and the few persons who quoted it afterwards during six or seven centuries, understood it in a Catholic sense. To require the Church to condemn a book of this description (even supposing it again to be bad) and under such circumstances, would indeed be preposterous; and to conclude from her silence in that case, any thing unfavorable to her constant doctrine, would be still more absurd; as if she approved all the obscure treatises which she does not positively condemn, or as if the law sanctioned all the crimes which it does not punish!

Let us now come to the second argument by which we promised to demonstrate the perpetuity of the Catholic faith on the eucharist, viz., the impossibility of any change having ever taken place in the doctrine of the Church. In fact, since the dogma of the real presence and transubstantiation was firmly believed by all Christians in the middle of the eleventh century,—since, on the other hand, our opponents maintain, how much soever against historical truth, that this dogma was not yet known and believed before and even during the ninth century—

* His most solemn recantation took place in a council held at Rome (A. D. 1079), where he consented to make the following profession of faith, in presence of the Pope and one hundred and fifty bishops: "I, Berengarius, believe from my heart and confess with my lips, that the bread and the wine laid on the altar are, through the mystery of the sacred prayer and the words of our Redeemer, changed into the true, real, and vivifying flesh, and into the blood of our Lord, Jesus Christ; and that after the consecration, it is his true body, which was born of the Virgin, was offered on the cross for the redemption of mankind, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father; and the true blood of Jesus Christ, which flowed from his side. This I do believe, and shall teach nothing to the contrary; so may God help me and his holy Gospel." Whether Berengarius was sincere in speaking thus, may be a matter of doubt; this at least is certain, that the formula proposed to him contained the plain doctrine of the Church, and that he was obliged to profess it, in order to be held orthodox.

a change in the doctrine of the Church, or, in other words, a transition of all Christians from the non-belief to the belief of the real presence and transubstantiation, must, according to our opponents, have taken place in the interval which elapsed between the middle of the ninth and the middle of the eleventh century; and this is indeed the period which Protestants commonly assign as the epoch of the pretended innovation. But how many absurdities are implied in such an admission!

Constant experience and the very nature of the human heart concur in showing that people are not easily induced to exchange the religious opinions in which they were educated, for doctrines opposed to them; especially when the former are easy and in accordance with the senses or prejudices of men, while the latter, on the contrary, contain mysteries calculated alike to humble the pride of reason, and check the passions of the heart. But even admitting that sometimes a change of doctrine may be effected in several persons, it is at least impossible that this should take place without a vast deal of remonstrance and opposition on the part of others, chiefly those whose interest or bounden duty it is to arrest the progress of the innovation. This has always been the case whenever a novelty in matters of religion was broached and began to be spread among the faithful of any country. Who does not know the innumerable and lasting disturbances which were occasioned in the Church by the Arian, Pelagian, Donatist, Nestorian and Eutychian heresies, as well as the powerful opposition which they met with in their progress, although they were much less hostile to human prejudices and passions, than was the ancient faith which they attacked? And would it have been just the reverse with regard to the pretended innovation about the eucharist? Would all Christians without exception and in a short time, have divested themselves of their natural and religious feelings, to admit a new doctrine, the most opposed to the senses and imagination that can be conceived; would they have admitted it as a part of the divine revelation given by Christ to his Church, whilst (as our adversaries contend), it was, to their own knowledge, a mere novelty, and not a word had been heard of it before? In fine, would they have adopted it without difficulty, without trouble, without opposition and protestation, as must be supposed in this case, since nothing of the kind can be discovered to have taken place in those times; and whilst the author, the rise and the progress of every heresy, even on much less important points, have been carefully noticed in every age, here on the contrary, by a strange overthrow of the moral laws which govern mankind, both the fact and the circumstances of the momentous innovation were immediately buried in perfect oblivion! what can be imagined more preposterous and absurd?

Indeed, if the belief of the incarnation and other mysteries of the Christian faith could not be spread and established throughout the world but by the incessant labors of the apostles and of their successors in the ministry, by the innumerable miracles of these holy men, by the sufferings and death of millions of martyrs, by encountering during the space of three hundred years, the most violent and bloody persecutions, as is attested by all ancient monuments, whether sacred or profane; what man enjoying the full use of his senses, will ever admit that the dogma of transubstantiation and real presence of Christ in the eucharist, which certainly is not less opposed to human pride and prejudices than the other mysteries of religion, was preached for the first time *during*, and unanimously adopted within a short time *after* the ninth century, without the aid of miracles, without the testimony of martyrs, without any disturbance, without opposition or protestation; in a word, so easily and quietly, that no mention, no vestige of such events can be found in any record?

And let it not be said that the tenth century having been a very dark age, in which ignorance everywhere prevailed, it was easy for an innovator to make the people adopt any notions that he might wish to intrude upon them; to assert this would be ridiculous in the extreme. In the first place, it

does not account in the least for the monstrous phenomenon of a most important change having occurred, without being noticed and mentioned by the writers of that age; a silence and neglect the more incomprehensible, as the eleventh century which Protestants have no reason to laud more than the tenth, has left us innumerable monuments of the disturbances excited by the attacks of Berengarius against the dogma of transubstantiation, and of the opposition which his doctrine of the real absence every where met with, so far that, besides being refuted by a multitude of learned bishops and doctors, Lanfranc, Guitmond, Algerus, &c., it was condemned by no fewer than fifteen councils, held within the space of thirty or forty years in the various parts of Christendom. Yet, it is self-evident that the task assumed by Berengarius was far easier and more agreeable to man's limited reason and depraved senses, than would have been an attempt to introduce among the faithful the belief of transubstantiation, if it had been previously unknown among them. If the words of Christ himself; "The bread which I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world. . . . . For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed" (John vi, 52, 56); if these words, we say, plain as they were, and supported by our Saviour's miracles and undeniable sanctity, found numerous gainsayers among his hearers, and even among his disciples, whom he therefore suffered to depart from him and to follow their own blind and rebellious reason (ibid. 53, 61, 67); what would it have been, if a mere man, an impostor, had ventured to preach the same dogma for the first time in the lapse of succeeding ages? Ignorance, however prevalent, would by no means have prevented a powerful opposition to such a doctrine, had it been new in the Church. Ignorant persons are indeed more easily induced than others, to embrace those novelties which favor and gratify their cupidity, their sensuality, or their pride; and this is, in reality, what chiefly promoted the rapid growth of Protestantism in Germany, and several other states of the north of Europe; but there are none more obstinate than persons of this description, in shutting their ears, their eyes and their hearts against any thing opposed to their prejudices, their customs and their disorderly passions. But what could be more effectual in producing these effects, than the doctrine and belief of the substantial presence of Christ in the holy eucharist, since its immediate consequence is the necessity of self-denial and great purity of conscience, to comply in a worthy manner with the divine precept of participating in the eucharistic banquet, and of receiving within us the immaculate body and blood of our Divine Saviour?

Nay more,—it might justly be said that no period of the Church was ever less adapted to a change in religious doctrine than the tenth century. For never perhaps was there an age of stronger and more lively faith; none in which the feelings of men were more perfectly identified with religion. Religion, as we learn from the history of those times, was then readily preferred to all other things; the Christians of the middle ages entertained for it the same affection and devotion that the ancient Greeks and Romans so often displayed for the defence of their liberty, and, to use the expression of a great poet:

"On comprenait alors, mieux qu'au siecle ou nous sommes,
Que l'interet des hommes
Ne doit point balancer la querelle des cieux."

How could it have been possible then, that men of this character, so firmly attached to the religious doctrines in which they had been raised, should have suffered them to be driven from their hearts and minds by a creed of new formation, and by opinions unknown to their fathers? If the heresies of Eutyches and Nestorius about the incarnation of the Son of God met, at the very moment of their appearance, with such powerful opposition among the degenerate Greeks, what would have been, among the much more eager and zealous Christians of western Europe, the fate of the bold innovator concerning the equally important point of the eucharist?

Moreover, the darkness and ignorance imputed to the tenth century, is far from

having been as profound and universal as is commonly asserted. Whatever may be said by those who are interested in representing it as an age of barbarism, there was even then, a large number of celebrated schools, *v. g.* those of Lyons, Paris, Oxford, Worms, &c., where both sacred and profane letters were taught with success. There existed in that very age several Popes conspicuous for their learning and piety, such as Gregory V, Leo VII, Sylvester II; many illustrious and holy prelates, St. Bruno, archbishop of Cologne; St. Adalbert, bishop of Prague; St. Ulric, bishop of Augsburg; St. Odo and St. Dunstan, archbishops of Canterbury;—many scholars, if not distinguished for their literary refinement, at least remarkable for their sound judgment and their knowledge of the sacred sciences, St. Notker, the monk of St. Gall; St. Odo, abbot of Cluny; Atto, bishop of Vercelli; Luitprand, bishop of Cremona; Flodoardus, canon of Rheims, &c.—many pious kings and emperors, Alfonso the Great and Ramirus II, in Spain; Edward, Athelstan, and Edgar, in England; St. Wenceslas, in Bohemia; Henry I and Otto the Great, in Germany;—many zealous and learned missionaries, who successfully preached the Gospel among the several tribes of eastern and northern Europe, and to whose apostolic labors, the Sclavonians, the Poles, the Normans, the Danes, the Russians, the Hungarians, were indebted alike for their conversion to Christianity, and the solid beginnings of their civilization. This having been the case in the tenth century, who can conceive the possibility of a new belief concerning the eucharist having been introduced into the Church, without provoking a general outcry of indignation and remonstrance against the novelty? Were the many virtuous and distinguished personages whom we have just mentioned, suddenly changed into beings of quite a different character; devoid of all reason, religion, and piety; so stupid as not to perceive the extraordinary and antichristian change of doctrine that was taking place all around them; so senseless as not to consider it sufficiently important to be resisted; so careless for the glory of God, and the salvation of souls, as to unite their own efforts with those of the first impostor, and thus positively concur in promoting the success of his impious innovation? Wonderful indeed must be the credulity that can admit such a complete and universal shipwreck of rational and religious feeling.

This, however, is not the last and the greatest absurdity to be encountered in the admission of Bishop Whittingham and his associates; they have still to account for the origin of that unanimous belief in the real presence and transubstantiation, which we have proved to exist as well among the schismatic Greeks, the Jacobites, and the Nestorians, as among Catholics. During the tenth century, the Greek schism, which had been commenced under Photius, was continuing to take deep root, whilst the Nestorian and Eutychian parties, which had separated themselves from the Latins five or six hundred years before, persisted as sternly as ever in their opposition to the church which had condemned their errors. Would all these have consented to receive from that church the profane novelty of a dogma unknown to their fathers on the subject of the eucharist? Would they not, on the contrary, have rejected it with scorn, and gladly availed themselves of the favorable opportunity thus presented of lodging a just accusation against the Catholic body? But there is nowhere to be found the least vestige of such an accusation—nay more, it was only against the enemies of transubstantiation and of the real presence that they launched all their anathemas, both when the Protestants of Germany solicited their alliance in 1574, and when the Huguenots of France accused them, about one hundred years later, of holding a doctrine different from that of Catholics in reference to the holy eucharist. Let, then, Bishop Whittingham, or any one else, explain how, when and where these oriental sects consented to adopt the pretended novelties broached by the *Romish Church* during the *dark ages.* Let him show, with the slightest shadow of reason and truth, from what source they derived their belief of transubstantiation, and of the true, real, and substantial presence of Christ in the eucharist, if not from the

doctrine of the apostles and the faith of that *primitive Catholic Church*, of which they were once members.

Such are the numerous contradictions and insuperable difficulties to be encountered in the admission of a doctrinal change having, at any period, taken place in the Catholic Church on the nature of the holy eucharist. How frail, therefore, and how completely insecure is the superstructure based on such an admission! How weak and desperate must be that cause which finds itself obliged to rest upon such a support! This is, in fact, the only conclusion to which the efforts of our opponents can lead the sincere inquirer. What can be said, when he sees them, in opposition to the overwhelming mass of authorities and arguments which prove, as plainly as can be desired, the apostolical origin and the perpetuity of the Catholic faith, preferring the *obscure* expressions of an *obscure* writer of the ninth century, expressions, too, which can be satisfactorily explained, and which do not prevent the general tenor of *his* book from being very unfavorable *to them?* What must be said of such a course, if not that it is the last and miserable effort of an agonising system? and who is the person, in the least mindful of the future destiny of his immortal soul, and convinced of the necessity of the true faith for salvation, that will remain attached to such a system, or be willing to stake upon it his eternal welfare!

MR. WEBSTER'S BUNKER HILL SPEECH.

Oration of Daniel Webster, delivered at Bunker Hill, June 17th, 1843. National Intelligencer, June 22d, 1843.

WE are of those whose admiration of Mr. Webster's intellectual and oratorical abilities is confined within no narrow limits. We deem that he is rightly placed by a distinguished critic, half-way between Demosthenes and Burke—for we know little in ancient or modern eloquence, with which some of his productions may not be fearlessly compared. Upon the present occasion, however, and with regard to the oration before us, we must be permitted to differ from what seems the general verdict of our cotemporaries. The Bunker Hill discourse has many traits of excellence which might build up the reputation of almost any but its author. It has passages worthy even of Mr. Webster—but in its scope, and tone, and spirit, we are free to say that it does not, in our judgment, rise to the standard by which that gentleman should be judged. The occasion was certainly a great one, and the actor was worthy of the drama. But although the time and place did furnish, most assuredly, just grounds of high national congratulation—they were pregnant, also, with materials which an eminent man might, aptly, have turned to the purposes of a solemn and impressive lesson. Mr. Webster, we think, did not improve the opportunity.

Our countrymen, it will be conceded, do not much need to be told of their greatness and glory. They have heard of those things on all possible occasions, and they are unfortunately much more apt, under ordinary circumstances, to be satisfied with reflections on their own grandeur, than to provide the elements for its future improved existence. Our wisdom and virtue are matters of which we have long been thoroughly persuaded. Of our liberty we have long entertained ideas, by no means restricted—and our tendency does not appear, at present, to lead us towards a narrower construction. We should have been delighted, therefore, if Mr. Webster had given us a little less of our excellences and privileges, with a great deal more of our duties. We were not prepared for the brevity of the didactic paragraph which closes the oration. We had hoped that the fourth of July and Plymouth Rock formularies would have

been for once discarded, and that the great, statesman-like intellect of the orator would have expanded itself over the broad field of our national defects and errors—our moral and social necessities. Instead of the suggestion that our national character rises above lucre and its temptations, we had anticipated a denunciation of that prurient love of gain, which every thinking man knows to be a crying evil among us. Instead of homage and hosannas to our love of law, we had hoped to hear a stern rebuke of our unquestionable disposition to trample the law and its restraints under our feet. We should have rejoiced, had we seen the glory of our sires held up—their purity and unsullied honor—not merely as a thing of pride and self-satisfaction, but as a warning against that incipient disregard of solemn plighted obligation, from the stain of which our national raiment, even now, needs cleansing. Not finding these things and others like them, in a place where we had looked for them, and where, if touched at all, they would have been enforced with eloquence, beauty and irresistible force, we say again, that we are disappointed in the oration, and cannot persuade ourselves that it adds many leaves to its author's laurels.

In his desire to please his countrymen, and more especially his fellow-citizens of New England, Mr. Webster was led, as is readily demonstrable, into some very singular historical statements and deductions. To these, which most properly belong to our columns, we propose devoting a few words. After a long and interesting introduction, which appropriately brings down the current of events to the battle of Bunker's Hill, the orator pauses to investigate the peculiar principles of our revolution, and to seek out their origin, in those changes of European civilization, which preceded and influenced the colonization of America. In the train of his reasoning, we find the following passages:

"*The spirit of commercial and foreign adventure*, therefore, on the one hand, which had gained so much strength and influence since the time of the discovery of America, and, on the other, *the assertion and maintenance of religious liberty* . . . . . were the powerful influences under which character was formed, and men trained for the great work of introducing English civilization, English law, and, what is more than all, Anglo-Saxon blood into the wilderness of North America. Raleigh and his companions may be considered as *the creatures principally of the first of these causes.* High-spirited, full of the love of personal adventure, excited too in some degree by the hopes of sudden riches from the discovery of mines of the precious metals, and not unwilling to diversify the labors of settling a colony with occasional cruising against the Spaniards in the West Indian seas, they crossed and recrossed the ocean with a frequency which surprises us, when we consider the state of navigation, and which evinces a most daring spirit. *The other cause peopled New England.* The Mayflower sought our shores under no high wrought spirit of commercial adventure, no love of gold, no mixture of purpose, warlike or hostile, to any human being. *Like the dove from the ark, she put forth only to find rest.* Solemn prayers from the shores of the sea in Holland had invoked for her at her departure the blessings of Providence. The stars which guided her were the unobscured constellations of civil and religious liberty. Her deck was the altar of the living God. Fervent prayers from bended knees mingled morning and evening with the voices of ocean and the sighing of the wind in her shrouds. Every prosperous breeze, which, gently swelling her sails, helped the Pilgrims onward in their course, awoke new anthems of praise, and when the elements were wrought into fury, neither the tempest, tossing their fragile bark like a feather, nor the darkness and howling of the midnight storm, ever disturbed, in man or woman, the firm and settled purpose of their souls to undergo all, and to do all that the meekest patience, the boldest resolution, and the highest trust in God could enable human beings to suffer or to perform."

We are well aware, that this notion in regard to the pilgrim fathers of New England, is the staple of the eastern historic muse, at all times and in all forms. It cannot be, however, that absurdity becomes

really less absurd, how much soever it may grow to seem so, from laborious reiteration, and we say, without fear of controversy, that no greater folly is to be found in the whole range of historical aberrations, than the idea, that the "Plymouth Pilgrims" were remarkable for "the assertion and maintenance" of religious liberty. To assert and maintain liberty, it is not merely necessary for us to earn the privilege of thinking and acting as we ourselves may deem meet—preventing the rest of the world from thinking and acting differently. Such a thing may, indeed, be a sort of liberty to us, who may have the predominance, but to those who may not be disposed to bend to our rule, it is, in sooth, a very one-sided sort of independence. In such a sense, power is always the advocate of liberty—for power always spurns restraint upon its own free will, and claims perfect freedom in restraining others. And yet, this was the only religious liberty which the "pilgrim fathers" sought, brought or tolerated. Their history is too accessible, to render this a matter of doubt.

In England, it is notorious that a large portion of the Puritans were not content to aim at religious equality, but ever strove to set up their peculiar tenets as the religion of the state.* They finally consummated this project, in a degree, at the death of Charles I, but during the previous strife which their pretensions generated, many of them fled from their native land to Holland. For twelve years they enjoyed in that country the largest possible freedom of conscience,† but with this they were not satisfied. Their idea of a theocracy never deserted them, and when, towards the close of the period referred to, dissensions had arisen among them, a portion of their number determined to seek, in the wilds of America, that exclusiveness of worship which, among civilized men, it was utterly impossible that they should ever be able to procure. It was then, not liberty which they sought, for that they had never ceased to possess among the Hollanders, and they left it without the shadow of compulsion. They did not go forth, "like the dove from the ark," as Mr. Webster's rhetoric would have it—nor could they have found, any where, more tranquil "rest," than that which was afforded by the place of their sojourn. The rampant zeal, which generated their dissensions among themselves, was the only foe which it was at all needful for them to encounter. That this zeal was sincere, we shall not pretend to deny—but that their faith and their principles were as narrow, as any that ever gave impulse to enthusiasm, is a fact quite as incontrovertible. Something more than sincerity is requisite to reconcile us with views, such as they entertained and executed. That cannot be the true spirit of Christianity, whose charity begins and ends at home—which knows no brotherhood, save in coincidence of speculation, and which finds hateful discord, in the near sound of its neighbor's prayer. In such a spirit, there may perhaps be something of the love of God, but the largest part is clearly love for ourselves. It is selfishness inwardly—intolerance outwardly. And yet, sorry are we to say, that this was, for the most part, the vaunted Puritan spirit. This—the love of religious isolation and exclusiveness—the hope of religious predominance through all time, was the main cause of the pilgrim emigration to this continent. This was the "unobscured constellation" by whose light the Mayflower was guided—let filial reverence and patriotic enthusiasm say what they may to the contrary. And to do the pilgrims justice, it is but fair to say, that they pretended to nothing more, and that, in word and deed, it was their constant effort, to show that they regarded toleration as an evil, from which they prayed deliverance. Could a voice from their ashes have been heard at Bunker Hill, it would have administered a stern rebuke to the speaker, who attributed, unjustly, to their character, that spirit of "liberty" which they deemed a sin.

It is not worth our while, to dwell upon the various incidents of Puritan history, by which it is so easy to make good what we have laid down. In 1631, the Plymouth colonies proclaimed their devotion to reli-

* 1 Bancroft, *p.* 280. Tyson's Histor. Disc. 14, 16, (Philadelphia, 1842.) Story's Misc. *W.* 60.

† 2 Hutchinson's Hist. Mass. *p* 405. 1 Bancroft, *pp.* 301, 302. Tyson's Disc. 18.

gious freedom, by enacting that no one but a "church member," should be a "freeman."* In keeping with this liberality was the further ordinance, compelling every man, under a penalty, to attend their public worship.† It is needless to remind our readers, that the amiable Roger Williams was exposed to banishment and persecution, for no other cause, than that he dared to say that persecution for conscience' sake was contrary to the doctrines of the Saviour.‡ Equally unnecessary would it be, to dwell upon the fate of the numberless other victims, who found exile, branding, whipping, imprisonment and death,§ to constitute the blessing which "the assertion and maintenance of religious liberty" secured to them, under the beneficent system of Puritan New England. Those who are curious may follow the Puritans to Maryland—where Calvert (forgotten by Mr. Webster) had planted, in real truth, the standards of redemption and freedom side by side together. They will there find the Puritan refugees, fostered and fed by the Catholic colonists, and then, in the true spirit of their whole history, seizing, when they were strong, the government which had nourished them when they were weak and wretched—persecuting unto death, the Catholics who had built up and offered them an asylum, and finally recording on a statute book, till then unpolluted, the most hateful principles of intolerant oppression.‖

For fear, however, that their deeds might not be sufficiently intelligible, the "Pilgrim Fathers" have left ample testimony in words, to satisfy the most incredulous. The "venerable Higginson"—as he seems by common consent to be entitled—made bold to say in 1663, "That which is contrary to the Gospel (as he understood it) hath no right, and therefore *should have no liberty.*"¶ The President Oakes, in 1673, poured forth his devotions to "meek-eyed charity" after this fashion. "The outcry of some is for liberty of conscience. This is the great Diana of the libertines of this age . . . . . I look upon toleration as *the first born of all abominations!*"* The amiable Sheppard—another "dove" from the "ark"—very unquestionably shows the lineal descent of toleration from the devil!† Deputy Governor Dudley ‡ adds the tribute of his poetic genius to the same principle, in the following euphonious lines—

"Let men of God in courts and churches watch,
O'er such as do a toleration hatch,
Lest that ill egg bring forth a cockatrice,
To poison all with heresy and vice!"

If these be not sufficient authorities for Mr. Webster's deductions, we trust that the following extract from a discourse of the holy Mr. Ward, of Ipswich, will be deemed of some conclusiveness in the controversy. "He that is willing to tolerate any unsound opinion, that his own may be tolerated, though never so sound, will, for a need, hang God's bible at the devil's girdle. It is said that men ought to have liberty of conscience, and that it is persecution to debar them of it: I can rather stand amazed, than reply to this; *it is an astonishment that the brains of men should be parboiled in such impious ignorance!* § So much, then, for the champions of religious liberty.

But this is not all. Warmed with his subject, the orator gives vent to his feelings in these eloquent passages.

"Look to that fair city, the abode of so much diffused wealth, so much general happiness and comfort; so much personal independence, and so much general knowledge. She fears no forced contributions, no siege or sacking from military leaders or rival factions. *The hundred temples in which her citizens worship God, are in no danger of sacrilege.* . . . . . Every where there is order; *every where there is security.* Every where the law reaches to the highest, and reaches to the lowest, *to protect him in his rights and to restrain him from wrong;* and over all hovers liberty, that liberty which our fathers fought and fell for on this very spot, with her eye ever watchful, and her eagle wing ever wide outspread."

* 1 Belknap's Hist. N. Hamp. 78. 1 Bancroft, 360.
† 1 Bancroft, 369. ‡ Ibid, 369.
§ Ibid, 450—458. Belk. 91. 2 Hutch. 22—60.
‖ 1 Bancroft, 262. McMahon's Maryland, 246. Annals of Annapolis, 93—100.
¶ 1 Belknap, 83.

* 1 Belknap, 84. † Id. Ib. ‡ Id. Ib.
§ Id. 88, and vide 1 Bancroft, 449.

We are told, by those who have been upon the spot, that over against the monument at Bunker's Hill, and full in view from the platform where Mr. Webster stood, the blackened and crumbling walls of the Ursuline Convent, near Charlestown, still mar the beauty of the landscape. Could the orator have forgotten the story which is told, so feelingly, by those poor ruins? Did they suggest to him no misgivings as to the reality of the "civil and religious liberty" which gave him so much inspiration?—Could it have escaped his memory, when he spoke of the "hundred temples" to which "sacrilege" could not come, and of "security" and "rights"—"protection" and "order"—that, on the very spot then full in his eye, the stars of midnight, but a few years back, had beheld a temple desecrated—the sacred emblems of religion trodden under ruffian feet, and a band of women and helpless children, driven out into the fields, naked and homeless? Did he not know that—more atrocious still—the assembled intelligence and virtue of Massachusetts had sanctioned, year after year, this unmanly outrage, by refusing indemnity to the outcast sufferers? How, then—with all these things in his view—with the records of history to prove the intolerance of the fathers, and the dishonored cloisters of Mt. Benedict to proclaim the bigotry of the children—how could Mr. Webster reconcile to his head or his heart—his taste or his judgment—to persuade the multitude before him, that their fathers venerated freedom of conscience, and that they themselves adored it—that toleration and liberality were their chief ornaments—that love of order was the crowning beauty of their lives? Whither will the people rush—to what extremity of evil—if the great intellects which rule them, will stoop to canonize their vices, and are willing to balance the plaudits of the moment, against perverted history and discarded fact?

The next step—and certainly one which cannot cause much surprise, after a review of the last—was, as our readers will see, an effort of Mr. Webster to satisfy his fellow citizens of New England, that their fathers, unlike all other colonists, came with no thirst of lucre, and that they themselves have, of course, been heirs to the same disinterested nobleness of character. By way of contrast, he presents to them the usual illustration, drawn from the Spanish colonization of our continent.

"Hæc placuit semel; hæc decies repetita placebit."

"The rapidity of these conquests is to be ascribed, in a great degree, to the eagerness, not to say the rapacity, of those numerous bands of adventurers who were stimulated to subdue immense regions, and take possession of them in the name of the crown of Spain. The mines of gold and silver were the incitements to these efforts, and accordingly settlements were generally made, and Spanish authority established on the immediate eve of the subjugation of territory, that the native population might be set to work by their new Spanish masters, in the mines. From these facts, the love of gold—gold not produced by industry, nor accumulated by commerce, but gold dug from its native bed in the bowels of the earth, and that earth ravished from its rightful possessors by every possible degree of enormity, cruelty, and crime—was long the governing passion in Spanish wars and Spanish settlements in America. . . . . England transplanted liberty to America, Spain transplanted power. England, thro' the agency of private companies and the efforts of individuals, colonized this part of North America by industrious individuals, making their own way in the wilderness, defending themselves against the savages, recognizing their right to the soil, and with a general honest purpose of introducing knowledge as well as Christianity among them. Spain stooped on South America like a falcon on its prey. Every thing was gone. Territories were acquired by fire and sword. Cities were destroyed by fire and sword. Hundreds of thousands of human beings fell by fire and sword. Even conversion to Christianity was attempted by fire and sword."

It is quite fashionable in New England, to speak of the May-flower expedition, as if it were a just representative of the spirit of colonization throughout that whole divi-

sion of our country—and as if all the primitive settlers were entitled to credit for the virtues attributed to the Plymouth Pilgrims. On the contrary, however, there is no good reason to believe that the subsequent emigrants differed at all from the rest of the human family, in the desire to better their condition, pecuniary quite as much as moral. Judge Story admits that great numbers were attracted by "too large commendations of the country and the commodities thereof" which were written to England, "somewhat hyperbolically"—"out of a desire to draw over others."* Dr. Smith asserts† that the same "chimerical views" animated the adventurers from all the nations of Europe, and he mentions especially, that by the London and Plymouth Companies, and the Council of Plymouth, as well as by Sir Walter Raleigh, a fifth of all the gold and silver to be found, was offered to the crown, as a motive for granting their patents. History is full to the point,‡ that neither Spaniards nor Portuguese were more hungry for the treasures of the earth than were the English people, until they found, after vain efforts, that they had unfortunately fallen upon a portion of the continent which was barren in such resources. Indeed, it could not well be otherwise—for, since the fall of Adam, we have no record of any people, who have refused to hunt or dig gold, whenever opportunity might offer. It would require a very enlarged faith for one to believe that even the pilgrim fathers would have allowed Potosi to remain unexplored, had its treasures lay concealed within the jurisdiction of their theocracy. Certain it is, that those good folks did suddenly acquire, if they did not bring over with them, a very laudable spirit of trade and money making,§ for they quite speedily coveted a monopoly of traffic with the natives, and managed to improve their fortunes, quite as readily, as others whose thoughts were less exclusively bent upon things above. As early as 1634, the Plymouth people had a quarrel, in the way of business, with the followers of Lords Brook and Say. Puritan and Independent shed each other's blood, and the enemies of both had cause to reproach them, thus early, "for making religion the professed motive to colonizing, and so soon after, killing one another, for the sake of beaver."* Further, it may be said, without offence, if Mr. Webster's doctrine of inheriting virtues be a true one—that there is food for inference as to the spirit of the New England colonists, in the well known fact, that their descendants are reasonably distinguished for their inclination to trade, and by no means conspicuous for their abhorrence of the root of all evil! When we add to all this, that the Virginians, whose progenitors Mr. Webster admits to have been "excited in some degree" by the love of gain from commerce and from mines, were quite as ready to bare their bosoms, in the contests of the revolution, as those descended from the pilgrim stock, and whose ancestral honor rested on "civil and religious liberty" alone—that, at the present day, the state of Virginia as highly prizes, and as strictly guards the heritage of revolutionary freedom, as any of the honored commonwealths of New England—it is difficult to say, in what consists the especial excellence to which the orator pays tribute.

In the matter of Spanish colonization, we cannot but think that the doctrines of the oration are quite as extravagant, as those to which we have already alluded. Whatever may be the difference, in a politico-economical point of view, we certainly can see none in morality, between the love of gold as displayed in mine-hunting, and the same passion when devoted to "beaver," or, as Mr. Webster would call it, "the spirit of commercial and foreign adventure." National magnificence and power may spring from one phase of the vice—national decline may, perhaps, be hastened by the other—but it is hard to discover why one should make men more rapacious than the other, or tend, in a greater degree, to weaken the kindly sympathies of humanity. It is cupidity itself, not the mode of its display, which corrupts and degrades us; it is the disease, not the symptom, which puts our moral health in

* Story's Misc. Writings, 45.
† 2 Wealth of Nations, 59.
‡ 1 Bancroft, 82, 83, 90—133, 118, 121, 242, 96.
§ Lingard, 185—187. 3 Hume, 103—187—198.
§ 2 Hutch. 416, 418. Tyson's Disc. 15.

* 2 Hutch. 418.

peril. Surely it needs not Mr. Webster's wide range of historical information, to know that the annals of commerce are deeply dyed with blood. If the history of trade, from the earliest times, did not place this fact beyond controversy, ample demonstration of its truth might be found in the Asiatic conquests of Great Britain, made in our own day and generation. In our own continent there has been, as we shall show, unhappily, nothing to weaken the force of the general truth. It seems to us then, a *non sequitur*, to say that the different modes of Spanish and English colonization resulted from the different fashions, after which gold was worshipped. Besides this, the historical facts in the case do not appear to us to be fairly stated. Spain is represented "in the armed and terrible image of her monarchy and her soldiery," descending upon the new world—acquiring territories—destroying cities—sweeping off "hundreds of thousands of human beings," and all "by fire and sword." England on the contrary is painted "in the winning and popular garb of personal rights, public protection, and civil freedom," sending forth "industrious individuals," who simply "defend themselves against the savages, recognizing their right to the soil." The impression produced by this contrast, undoubtedly is, that English colonization protected and fostered the aborigines—Spanish colonization swept their very name from the earth. No man can read it without some such inference. It is unnecessary to say how far such a conclusion wanders from the truth. It is true that the English system and that of Spain were different. England permitted her citizens to emigrate and build up their own strength, nor did she care to meddle with them, until their energy had made the prize well worth the snatching. Spain, on the contrary, pursued her conquests as a nation. She sent forth her generals and governors—she moved with rapidity and power. As a necessary consequence, the Spanish dominions were soon won, while the English colonists struggled weakly and wearily on. All the enormities which Spain saw fit to perpetrate, or which her adventurers committed in the heat and haste of triumph, were concentrated in a small and conspicuous space. Those of the English colonists were scattered over a long period of years, not gathered and grouped together. They seem small, because we at no time see their whole multitude or bearing. But was the sum total of Anglo-Saxon oppression and outrage the less swollen, because its items are comparatively small and wide apart? If "fire and sword" accompanied "conversion to Christianity" in Mexico and South America, it is none the less true that treaties and rum were companions equally fatal to our "generally honest purpose of introducing knowledge as well as Christianity among" our aborigines. Three centuries and a half have rolled on since the discovery of the continent. If England came "like the dove from the ark," and "Spain stooped on South America like a falcon," it will not be difficult to show where the olive branch of the dove was planted, to shelter the Indian: and to point out the desolation which the falcon has left. If our fathers "recognized the right of the savages to the soil," while the Spaniards "ravished the earth from its rightful possessors, by every possible degree of enormity, cruelty and crime"—the results of such widely differing systems must at this day be palpable, in the utter extinction of the Indian race in the Spanish settlements, and its prosperity and populousness among us. Alas! what Mr. Webster calls "rapacity" has left behind it millions of Indians, converted to Christianity and in a great degree bent to civilization—living, in industry mostly, in competence not seldom—inhabitants of the very territories where their fathers dwelt, and happy according to their fashion. In our land, the descendants of those to whom a continent belonged, present a somewhat sadder picture. Driven far away from us, there remain but a few thousand wretches, the ragged victims of drunkenness, disease and crime. Of religion, what have they to comfort or improve them? Of protection, they know only the name and the mockery. Of civilization and social happiness, they have had no sweet experience. Of education, the only item which we have consistently impressed on them, is the philosophical truth, that the

horizon is an imaginary line, receding ever before them, as the march of our empire goads their weary exile, towards the shore of the western ocean. If then, religion and charity are known by their fruit, where do we stand in the contrast? What comparative account have we rendered of our stewardship, in the matter of that regard for the rights of others, which conscious freedom is said to generate? What proof have we given, that the spirit of trade is less favorable to "rapacity" than the shaft of the miner? May not history say to us indignantly, that covetousness is one and the same, let it be displayed as it may—

"Hinc cruor, hinc cædes, mors propiorque venit?"

Leaving inferences, however, and going back to facts themselves, it is necessary to say that Mr. Webster has laid down two principal propositions, which have no warrant in history. These are—first, that "the robbery and *destruction of the native race was the achievement of standing armies, in the right of the king, and by his authority; fighting in his name for the aggrandizement of his power and the extension of his prerogatives:*" and secondly, that, "conversion to Christianity was attempted by fire and sword."

Upon the first of these, we shall content ourselves by referring the reader to Dr. Robertson's history,* the writer of which will surely not be charged with any undue partiality for the Spanish conquerors. After tracing the course of the Spanish monarchs from the time of Isabella, and showing how constantly they endeavored to secure the happiness of their Indian subjects, by a series of laws, "framed with wisdom and dictated by humanity," he proceeds to explain the modes in which the charitable policy of the crown was constantly thwarted, by private cupidity and oppression. In direct contradiction then, to the absolute assertion of Mr. Webster, that the destruction of the native race, was "by authority" of the king, and for "the aggrandizement of his power," the historian concludes: "the desolation of the new world should not then be charged on the court of Spain, or be considered as the effect of any system of policy adopted there."* When to this we add the parallel declaration of Heeren,† that "no government has done so much for the aborigines as the Spanish," it seems hardly necessary to pursue this branch of the subject to any greater extent.

Upon the question of intolerant and anti-christian attempts at conversion, the character of the Spanish missionaries can be vindicated with equal facility. From the moment that ecclesiastical instructors were sent into America, it is notorious‡ that they took ground against the oppression of the natives, and adopted a course themselves, "in conformity to the mild spirit of that religion, which they were employed to publish."§ When Cortes, victorious over the Tlascalans, would have cast down their idols by force, the missionary who accompanied his expedition as chaplain, proclaimed the holy truth "that religion was not to be propagated by the sword, or infidels to be converted by violence,"‖ and Cortes required from the barbarians by force, no other obedience, than to his edict for the abolition of human sacrifices. After the enumeration of incidents such as this, throughout his whole history, the author whom we quote concludes, by saying,¶ "with still greater injustice have many authors represented the intolerating spirit of the Roman Catholic religion as the cause of exterminating the Americans, and have accused the Spanish ecclesiastics of animating their countrymen to the slaughter of that innocent people, as idolaters and enemies of God. . . . . From the accounts which I have given of the humane and persevering zeal of the Spanish missionaries, in protecting the helpless flock committed to their charge, they appear in a light which reflects lustre on their function. They were ministers of peace, who endeavored to wrest the rod from the hands of oppressors. To their powerful interposition, the Americans were indebted for every regulation, tending to mitigate the rigor of their fate."

* Book viii, Sect. iv.

* Book viii, Sect. iv. † In notis 3 Prescott, 476.
‡ Rob. Hist. Amer. Book iii, Sect. xxviii.
§ Id. Ib. ‖ Id. Book v, Sect. xxxviii.
¶ Id. Book viii, Sect. v, and note lii.

In immediate connection with this subject, we must not omit to notice the republic founded by the Jesuits in Paraguay, where for nearly one hundred and fifty years, they realized the beautiful dreams of Plato—with the better and higher grace, which was given by enlightened and practical Christianity. Instead of "fire and sword," the missionaries bore only with them the arms of good will, persuasion, and peace. Submitting to every sacrifice and privation—they impressed upon their converts the truths of religion, by illustrating in their conduct its ennobling influence. "Power and military force" were no part of their machinery. Gold and precious stones were no objects of their labor. Instead of oppression they bestowed on the barbarians a system of government that fitted them to enjoy the rights and discharge the duties which it protected and exacted. Religion was the active agent of the system, but it was religion without fanaticism. "The benefits of trade were experienced, without the fatal contagion of its vices."* Under the influence of such administration, the people grew to be respectable, virtuous, and brave—with all the elements of order and prosperity at home, and the means of triumphantly resisting the aggressions of strangers. Not only have men of letters and benevolence dwelt with enthusiasm† upon this realization of a polity which elsewhere history has never told of—but grave writers upon law have characterized it as "a glorious undertaking, to render government subservient to human happiness."‡ With the suppression of the Society of Jesus in Spain, this triumph of their wisdom ended its beneficent career—but so long as history continues, or can be rendered, unfettered and truthful, the records of the "Christian Republic" must give food to honorable pride, and warm religious hope. Yet, why is it that facts like the existence of the republic of Paraguay should be forgotten, even by men of ability and knowledge, in the spirit of declamatory generalization? Why is it that philanthropic efforts, to which the history of our northern colonization affords no parallel, should be overlooked in a historical disquisition on religious toleration and humanizing civilization? It seems that the picture of southern conquest—dark enough in truth—is to be made midnight altogether, and that any bright gleamings which in reality belong to it, are to be shut out from view, as impertinently varying the plan prescribed and pre-determined.

We might enlarge our article by pursuing this train of thought, through other portions of Mr. Webster's discourse, to which it is equally applicable. Especially, we might comment upon the singular idea that the "aggrandizement of its power, and the extension of its prerogatives" was, at the time of the settlement of America, in any greater degree the inclination of the Spanish than the English monarchy. It would be curious too, to investigate the extent of our obligations to England for a religious liberty, which, by Mr. Webster's own showing, our ancestors were driven away to seek where they could best find it—and for civil and political freedom which we only won from her in spite of herself, after long years of toil and bloodshed, such as the Bunker Hill monument commemorates. These topics, however, belong, perhaps more appropriately, elsewhere, and we shall leave them to be canvassed by our readers.

It has of course been in no wise our purpose in what we have said, to weaken, in the most shadowy particular, the reverence due to the men of our revolution. We are satisfied with the virtues which they possessed in reality, without violating history to show that they took perfection by descent. Less perhaps, than any other men who ever conducted a revolutionary movement, do they need a partial chronicling. They had gradually outgrown many of the defects and follies which their ancestors had brought with them. They were educated, virtuous and brave—submissive without cringing—independent without license. Let us not, however, claim for all who emigrated to our shores, the exclusive possession of the whole catalogue of virtues.

* 4 Edinburgh Encyclopedia, 798.

† Chateaubriand, Genie du Christ. Part 4, book 4, chapters 4 and 5.

‡ Mont. Spirit of Laws, book iv. chap. vi.

It does not follow that because they were excellent in many things, they were admirable in all—nor are we at all bound to adore or conceal their errors, because we bless the good that was in them. If their reputation is dear to us, truth is, or ought to be dearer—and when we are disposed to bend or modify it, in order to exalt their merits, it is well worth our while to examine whether the effort does not spring from our own pride, rather than a wish to make them glorious for their own sakes. Far better, then, in our humble judgment, would Mr. Webster have done, had he impressed on us as a people, the importance of remedying our defects, instead of glorying in our superiority over others—far better had he taught us the means of reaching greater excellence in future, instead of swelling the account of our excellence in the past and present. Above all, it would have been in far better taste, if Calvert and Penn had not been forgotten in the history of "religious toleration," and if the great primitive torrent of freedom which dashed itself on our whole coast, had not been narrowed into the single wave, which broke on the rock of Plymouth.

THE BOQUET.

TO A FRIEND.

O TAKE the simple flowers I send,
And to their speech a hearing lend;
For, let imagination be,
Interpreter 'twixt them and thee,
And they will whisper beauteous tales
Of sunny hills and quiet vales,
Where sister flow'rets blossom still
In rich profusion, and the rill
With gentle murmur glides along,
In a low, ceaseless, joyous song;
Where oft with bright and dewy eye,
They upward looked, and saw the sky
Of deepest blue, the leaves between
Of some great oak, whose young, fresh green
Formed a soft shadow o'er the bed
Of moss where they were born and bred;
And they will tell how oft they've heard
The soft notes of some happy bird,
Whose dwelling was among the leaves
That rustled with each passing breeze,
And how, through morning's dewy prime,
And the bright sun's meridian time,
And milder evening's western glow,
Till night would o'er them gently throw
Her shadowy mantle, they had sprung
To life and being, till among
Fair kindred forms their lot must be
(A happy one!) to pleasure thee.

ST. BERNARD AND HIS BELOVED JERUSALEM.

A SKETCH FROM THE CHURCH HISTORY OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

BY W. JOS. WALTER, AUTHOR OF "THE LIFE AND TIMES OF SIR THOMAS MORE," ETC.

"I do love those ancient ruins:
We never tread upon them but we set
Our foot upon some reverend history.
And questionless, here in this open court,
Which now lies naked to the injuries
Of stormy weather, there are those interred,
Who loved the Church so well, and gave so largely,
They thought it would have canopied their bones
Till doomsday: but there all things have their end."

Webster (1620).

NAPOLEON, when on his way to assume the iron crown of Lombardy, passed through the department of Saône et Loire, in which the town of Clugni is situated. He was met in the neighboring town, where he stopped to change horses, by a deputation from the Commune, with a request that he would honor them by passing through their town. Napoleon sternly replied, "Away with you!—You are a race of vandals—you suffered your grand and beautiful abbey, with its magnificent church, to be sold and destroyed. I shall not visit Clugni:" and he passed on without turning out of his road.

The fact to which Napoleon alluded, was this. When in 1793 the poor monks of this venerable monument of Catholic France, were driven without pity from their home, to seek an asylum in a world to which they were strangers, the mayor of Clugni, anxious to save from the fury of the ruffians of the revolution, an edifice which was the pride and ornament of the commune, undertook a journey to Paris in order to petition the directory that the abbey might be converted into an asylum for disabled and destitude soldiers, similar to that of the Hospital des Invalides. He made great interest with those in power, but his praiseworthy purpose was defeated by the intervention of the inhabitants of the commune of Clugni, who, wishing to make money of the materials and the ground, presented a remonstrance against the proposed disposition of this church property. Their petition, which in all probability was backed by a promise of a share in the spoils, was favorably received, and the mayor on his return had the mortification to witness the demolition of one of the noblest architectural monuments that his country had to boast. The church, which had been the wonder of Europe, was first demolished, its costly ornaments were disposed of at public auction, and its fine chime of bells were melted into cannon for the use of the republican armies. But the strong walls of the venerable abbey offered a formidable resistance, and the spoilers, unable to separate the solid masses of masonry, called in a detachment of the revolutionary troops to assist their impotent malice and cupidity in completing the work of destruction. When this was accomplished, when the last offending buttress had been battered down, and the walls of the once stately abbey of Clugni were levelled with the ground, they made a pile of the curious carved work and statues of wood, which had adorned the pulpit, the side chapels, and the choir, and setting fire to them in the public square, terminated the godly work by dancing round the blazing materials with the yells of savages and the furor of bacchanalian madness.

In the year 1811, the site of the abbey was occupied by a cavalry stable, or training house for the military of the department. The southern bell-tower, and a chapel enclosing a tomb, supposed to be that of the

founder, Peter the Venerable, the beloved friend and companion of St. Bernard,* are the only remains that exist of the ancient edifice.

The feeling denunciation of Napoleon against the vandals who doomed to destruction the church and abbey of Clugni, is scarcely less applicable to the spoliation of the equally celebrated monastery of Clairvaux, founded by St. Bernard, and which he used affectionately to term—"*His beloved Jerusalem.*" The following is an outline of its history.

The original foundation was greatly augmented by Thibaud, count of Champagne, and by his son-in-law, Philip, count of Flanders, whose tombs yet exist amidst all the dilapidation of the place. In the year 1174, the Church, a fine Gothic edifice, was built by Gaston, bishop of Landres, the diocesan. It contained seats in the nave for one thousand monks, "which," says a reformer in taste and religion, writing in 1727, "have lately been removed, out of deference to modern views and modern convenience." The abbey which had been rebuilt in St. Bernard's time, to accommodate the number who continued to flock to its asylum, was again found incapable of containing the unceasing votaries who sued for admission; and by the side of the modest building erected by the first abbot and his companions, which reverence to his memory would not allow to be touched, a sumptuous palace arose, of which the dormitories, the refectory, the chapter-house and the library, were in the most elaborate style of architecture, and adorned with statues of St. Bernard and his companions.

The spirit of the order, however, greatly declined, and although efforts were made to re-establish among its members the fervor of primitive discipline, but a temporary reformation was effected under the Abbot Denys L'Argentier. What his feelings were in regard to the lax discipline of the order, may be gathered from an expression which fell from his lips. When praying before the shrine of St. Bernard, he was heard to exclaim: "Alas, O blessed saint and founder of our order, what avails it that we possess the relics of thy earthly body, if thy spirit be no longer among us?" He re-established the ancient discipline, and though at an advanced age, he worked harder than any of his monks in the manual labors prescribed by their rule. Cardinal Richelieu having been subsequently elected general of the order, likewise took measures to introduce a reform among the monks of that institute. At length came a convulsion which swept away reformed and unreformed, with indiscriminate rigor. In the French revolution of 1790, there were but five and forty monks to be expelled by its violence from the once populous monastery of Clairvaux. The abbey was dismantled, of course, and is now used as a house of correction for criminals—two thousand prisoners being employed there in the manufacture of various stuffs, &c.

In contrast with these principal details of ruin and desecration, it will be refreshing to turn to St. Bernard, and the original foundation of this celebrated retreat. Bernard's father, Tecelin by name, a knight of an ancient and noble family, was too much engaged in deeds of arms, to have leisure to devote himself to the education of his son, and this important charge devolved on his mother Alice, a woman of great piety and gentleness of disposition. At the period in question, there appeared to be no choice between the turbulent and dissolute mode of life of the upper ranks, too often connected with deeds of rude and lawless violence, and the seclusion of a monastic life, which, by the very force of contrast, was held in greater veneration. The pious Alice felt persuaded, that in dedicating her seven children, of whom Bernard was the third, to the cloister from the moment of their birth, that she was dedicating them to God. This conviction was strengthened at the birth of Bernard, by a dream, which a monk, to whom she had applied for counsel, interpreted as indi-

* In a letter to Pope Eugenius, St. Bernard thus writes of Peter, who had undertaken a journey to Rome, and the warmth of affection with which he speaks, does honor to his heart. "Nothing can separate us; neither the height of the Alps, nor the frozen snows, nor the length of the way. Even while penning these lines I am with him,—I am at his side." And Peter, on his part, was heard to declare that he should prefer passing his life with St. Bernard, to the enjoyment of all the honors the world could bestow.

cating that the child would prove a steadfast and zealous champion of the Church. Alice herself, unlike other women of her condition, led a quiet secluded life, shunning all worldly pomp. Her hospitable mansion was, however, always open to the clergy ; and for some time before her death, she imparted to her house a still more monastic appearance, dividing her time between deeds of fasting, almsgiving and prayer. It was here that young Bernard imbibed the first elements of education, till his mother, who, in pursuance of the indication of her dream, destined him for the priesthood, sent him to the church of Chetillon, in order to receive the instruction preparatory to his future course. In this school, which enjoyed a high and merited reputation, he made a rapid progress in the cultivation of the Latin language, and of the belles-lettres, and afterwards outstripped his companions in the graver studies of logic and philosophy. Six months after Bernard's quitting this plan of education, he had the unhappiness to be deprived of his pious and affectionate mother. Her death is thus described by a contemporary writer, John the Hermit, who was present at the mournful scene. "Alice was accustomed to celebrate the festival of St. Ambrose, the patron saint of the church of Fontaines, Bernard's native place, by an annual feast, to which the neighboring clergy were invited. On the vigil of that day, she was seized with a violent fever, which confined her to her bed. Previous to this, she had a presentiment of her approaching end, which she had communicated to her family. The next morning, she requested that the holy eucharist might be brought to her, and feeling strengthened after its reception, she desired that the clergymen would set down to the feast she had provided. While they were at table, she sent for her eldest son Guido, and desired that he would request the company to repair to her chamber, when the repast was ended. When they came, and were standing round her bed, Alice calmly announced that the moment of her departure was at hand, and entreated the aid of their prayers. The ministers of the Lord began to recite the litany, Alice herself making the responses, as long as her strength lasted ; but when the ministers came to the verse, 'By thy cross and passion, good Lord deliver us,' the dying woman, commending her soul to God, raised her hand to make the sign of the cross, and in that attitude expired ; yielding up her soul into the hands of ministering angels, by whom it was borne to the abode of the just, and where in peace it awaiteth the reunion with the body, on the great day of resurrection, when our Lord and mediator Jesus Christ, shall come to judge the living and the dead." Another contemporary writer says of her,—"She was often to be seen alone and on foot, on the road between Fontaines and Dijon, visiting the cottages of the poor, carrying provisions and medicine to the sick and needy, and availing herself of every favorable moment for administering to them instruction and spiritual consolation. She always went unattended, never allowing her domestics to assist her in these deeds of mercy ; so that it might truly be said of her that 'her left hand knew not what her right hand had performed.' Alice was buried at Dijon, in the year 1110, where her remains reposed for nearly a century and a half when they were transported with pious care to the church of Clairvaux, the scene of the spiritual labors of that son of hers, to whose great usefulness in the cause of piety and truth, she had been so blessedly instrumental."

Let us return to Bernard. The young nobles his companions, availing themselves of the absence of those influences which his pious mother had exerted, sought to draw him into their society, and by means of the exciting adventures and amusements of the age, to overpower his inclination for the cloister. But their efforts were unavailing; Bernard had tasted of more solid satisfactions, and worldly pleasures and chivalrous enterprises had no attractions for him. They then endeavored to work upon his mind by other means.

After the nations had aroused themselves from the comparatively mental slumber of the tenth century, a wonderful enthusiasm for literature and philosophy had been excited among them, especially in France; and the youth who had previously aspired

to honor only in the armory of war, now sought it by the keener weapons of the schools. Bernard's associates then endeavored to withdraw him from his attachment to a monastic life through these studies; and here they met with better success, for these were congenial to his ardent and aspiring mind. But the impression so deeply received, was not to be easily effaced. The image of his beloved mother was constantly before his mind; he thought over the discourses she had held with him, and the plans of life they had devised together; and the fervor of his imagination led him to believe that she sometimes took her stand by his bedside, and angrily reminded him that it was not for such vanities, but with far higher hopes, that she had directed his education.

On one occasion in particular, as he was journeying alone to meet his brothers, who were in the camp of the Burgundian army, then engaged in besieging the castle of Granci, this idea took possession of him, and the image of his chiding mother filled his whole soul. Overcome by his emotions, he retired into a church which was upon the roadside, and open, as all churches should be, at all hours, for the furtherance of the means of grace. Here he prayed with deep earnestness that God would confirm him in his purpose of following a religious life. He arose strengthened from his prayer, and with that ardor which was his distinguishing characteristic through life, he not only hastened to put his resolution into effect, but also sought to communicate his own views and feelings to his kinsfolk and friends. With many his persuasions were effectual. His uncle, a wealthy landed proprietor, and a man of high renown in arms, was the first to join him, and his example was followed by all Bernard's brothers who were come of age, except Gerard, his second brother. He had distinguished himself in deeds of chivalry, and at the same time had conciliated universal esteem and affection by his prudence and kindness of heart. But he rejected all the arguments of Bernard and treated this sudden resolution of his brothers as an impulse of the moment which a little reflection would correct. On this occasion Bernard gave indications of that unyielding confidence, not to say anticipation of the future, which afterwards bore him onward through every obstacle that appeared to impede his progress. After a long, but ineffectual argument with Gerard, he exclaimed: "Yes, brother, I see it all. It is only by suffering that you will be brought to reflection; and," he continued, placing his hand on Gerard's side, "it shall come to pass, and that quickly too. A lance shall pierce your side, and thus open your heart to the counsels of salvation which you now reject." The prediction was verified; Gerard being wounded by a lance and left on the field of battle, was taken prisoner by the enemy. In this situation, and fearing for his life, he despatched a messenger to entreat the presence of his brother. Bernard was prevented from going, but he returned this answer: "Your wound is not unto death, but unto life." Gerard contrived to effect his escape, joined his brothers, and with them embraced the monastic life. Of his subsequent conduct and character we shall have occasion to learn from St. Bernard himself, and particularly from the pathetic funeral discourse which he preached on Gerard's happy death.

On the day that Bernard united himself to the chosen few whom he had won over to his vows, he repaired with them to church. One of the first texts which met their ear was that of the great apostle Paul: "Being confident of this very thing, that he who hath begun a good work in you, will perfect it unto the day of Jesus Christ." This was regarded by Bernard as a voice from heaven to encourage him and his companions to persevere; and it gave occasion to an animated discourse in which he confirmed the resolution of his followers, and prevailed upon others to renounce the world, and join them in their pious enterprise. Some of these new votaries being married, he thought it incumbent on him to provide a retreat for those pious ladies who participated in the purpose of their husbands, and he caused the nunnery of Juilly, in the diocess of Langres, to be erected for them; an establishment which

soon acquired wealth and celebrity. Guido, Bernard's eldest brother, and his wife had separated by mutual consent to devote themselves wholly to God, and she became the first abbess of the convent. Here also Hombeline, another of Bernard's sisters, subsequently retired, after the death of her husband, the brother of the duchess of Lorraine. This noble lady was also brought by St. Bernard to a sense of religion. An extract from one of the saint's letters, will show the influence he had acquired. "I thank God for your pious care of his servants; and of this be assured, that where we see the least spark of heavenly love in a heart of flesh, formerly puffed up by the pomps and the passions of this world, it is the result of divine grace, and not of human virtue. I entreat you to salute the duke, your husband, from me; and I exhort you both by the love of God, to yield up the castle which you are preparing to defend, if you have any doubt of the justice of your pretensions. Forget not, I entreat you, that warning voice—'What will it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his own soul?'"

Meanwhile the work of self-devotion went bravely on. Bernard engaged a house at Châtillon where he spent six months with his companions, for the purpose of affording them time to arrange their affairs. It was usual for those who had determined to embrace a monastic life, to keep their intention secret till the time arrived for its fulfilment; and thus it excited the greater astonishment that so many persons of all ages were seen resolved on renouncing wealth, honors, nay, domestic affection itself, without swerving from their resolution during the long interval of probation preceding its accomplishment; and more than all, when this marvellous change was seen to be effected by the influence and eloquence of a young man of three and twenty.

It was a proof of Bernard's humility, that, instead of aspiring to the honor of being the founder of a new religious order, like other men of eminent piety at this period, he preferred joining a fraternity already established. Nor did he think fit to make choice of any of the richer and more illustrious abbeys, that of Clugni, for instance, the heads of which had long been held in honor by Popes and emperors. He selected a monastery poorly endowed and numbering but few members, the many being deterred by its poverty, and by the extraordinary austerity of its discipline. This was the convent of Citeaux, of the Cistercian order, situated in a barren wilderness in the diocess of Chalons-sur-Saône, and founded in the year 1098, by Robert, a nobleman of Champagne, in whom the laxity which he had witnessed in other convents had excited the desire of devoting himself, with a few companions, to a stricter course of life, and one more in accordance with the letter of the Benedictine rule. To this convent, then presided over by Stephen Harding, an Englishman, and the second successor of Robert, Bernard retired with more than thirty associates, in the year 1113.

A little anecdote associated with this event must not be forgotten. When Bernard and his brothers were taking a final leave of their paternal home, the eldest brother, addressing Nivard, the youngest, who was playing with the children in the street, exclaimed: "Well, little brother of mine, the whole of our inheritance will now become yours;" to which the boy with something above childish simplicity, rejoined: "What! do you take heaven for yourselves, and leave me but the earth? That is not a fair division." It may be added that the little Nivard, when of riper years, joined his brethren, and that Tecelin, their father, unable to bear the loss of his sons, retired to Clairvaux soon after the establishment of that house, took the vows, and died there in the arms of St. Bernard, in 1118. His patrimony, the Chateau of Fontaines, the birth-place of our saint, which had reverted to the crown, was granted by Louis XIII, to the congregation of the Feuillans, and by them converted into a monastery: thus, to use the words of a contemporary writer, "was the whole burnt offering made."

In his retreat St. Bernard soon excited observation and astonishment by the personal activity which he had the power of combining with the most profound abstrac-

tion of mind, and by the perfect subjection of the body to the spirit. One of the duties of the institute was to cultivate the land for the support of the community. During the hours devoted to field-labor, his mind was elevated to the contemplation of that which lies beyond and above nature; and in after years he was heard to declare, that "any knowledge of divine things that he might possess, or any facility in explaining the Holy Scriptures, had been obtained through meditation and prayer among the woods and in the fields, with but the beeches and the oaks for his teachers."*

The reputation of such a man could not fail to draw many votaries to Citeaux; the convent could not furnish accommodations for the increasing numbers who flocked to its sanctuary; and some other place was to be sought, in order to suit the exigency of the time. In the bishopric of Langres, and within a league or two of Bar-sur-Aube, there was a wild and desolate spot, where a robber's cave had existed, and which from the plant wormwood (*artemisia absinthium*), which grew abundantly there, went by the name of the Valley of Wormwood (*Vallis Absinthialis*); but after the valley was cultivated, it obtained the name of Claravallis, clear or bright valley.† The site had been granted to Abbot Harding, by Hugo, a knight of Champagne, who had gone on a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre, and subsequently joined the Knights Templars. Here Bernard laid the foundation of that monastery which soon became so famous, and contributed more than any other, to the extension and celebrity of the Cistercian order. When a building sufficient for present exigencies was completed, Bernard, then in the third year of his profession, was called to preside as abbot over the new establishment. He set out for this new residence, accompanied by his four brothers, his uncle Gauldry, by four monks, two bearing the name of Godfrey, one of whom was his relative, and the two others, aged men, Elbold and Guibert by name, and by an acolothist, known by the name of "Young Robert." The number twelve was chosen in allusion to the apostolic college, while the father abbot was supposed to represent the Divine Founder of the same.

The ceremonial observed on the occasion was simple and affecting. After a solemn service, the newly elected abbot received from the hands of Harding, the superior of Citeaux, a processional cross. He then rose, and delivering the cross into the hands of young Robert, the acolothist, quitted the church, followed by his twelve associates, and having taken leave of the brethren of Citeaux, the infant community departed, chanting an appropriate psalm. "When," says the Cistercian Chronicle, "Bernard and his twelve monks silently took their departure from the church, you might have seen tears in the eyes of all present, while nothing was to be heard but the voices of those who were singing the hymns; and even these brethren could with difficulty repress their sobs, notwithstanding that sense of religion which led them to make the strongest efforts to command their feelings; both those who remained, and those who departed, were infected with one common sorrow. At length the procession, which moved slowly, reached the gate which stood open for their departure, and which closed upon the inmates of Citeaux."

In order to receive abbatical ordination, Bernard repaired to the bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne, the celebrated Guillaume de Champeaux, afterwards founder of the abbey of St. Victor, in Paris. Bernard,

* "This life of ours, exempt from public haunts,
Find tongues in trees, books in the running brooks
Sermons in stones, and good in every thing."
Shakspeare.

† A traveller gives the following description of the spot. "One cannot contemplate the valley of Clairvaux on a fine day, without feeling that it deserves the name,—the situation being extremely beautiful, lying open to the sun's rays in every direction. It is formed by two hills of gentle acclivity, one to the north, the other to the south of the valley. These hills extend towards a third eminence, by which it is divided into two long and narrow gorges at the western extremity. On the east it loses itself in a fertile plain, watered by the river Aube. The rays of the sun are thus darted full on the valley during the morning, while the declivities on the north and south, which recede as they approach the east, receive them during the remainder of the day. The light being thus continually reflected from the hills, no part of the circuit, except that covered by the woods, is in shadow, till the fall of eve, when the western hills receive the luminary, which sets in splendor behind the curtain of woods which fringe the heights.

who was then in his twenty-sixth year, is described as being so thin and emaciated as rather to resemble a tenant of the tomb than a living being. He was accompanied by a stout and well made Cistercian, and so striking was the contrast, that the good bishop could scarcely refrain from smiling, while some of the younger of his attendants burst into downright laughter. The prelate, who recognized the master mind, which, veiled beneath the mantle of humility, animated that wasted frame, became Bernard's most zealous friend and admirer, and during the rest of his life rendered him many very important services.

It was evident that the rigid mode of living which Bernard had followed, must, if persisted in, prove fatal to his declining health. Apprehensive of this, the bishop obtained from the Cistercian chapter the superintendence of his friend for the space of one year. Anxious to restore his languid frame, he caused a sort of hut to be erected for him beyond the cloisters, where he was to remain for a stated time, without interfering with the affairs of the monastery.

A description of a visit to him in this situation, from the pen of his friend, the Abbot Guillaume de St. Thierry, will not fail to interest the reader. "It was about this time (1116) that my visit to Clairvaux commenced, and coming in company of another abbot to seek the saint, I found him in his cell, which was similar to those seen constructed on the road-side for the reception of persons suffering with the leprosy. He had been relieved from the presidency of the convent, by the interference of the bishop, and the command of the chapter; and we found him enjoying a state of perfect tranquillity, living only to God, and transported with joy as though he had already tasted the delights of Paradise. When I entered this palace of the woods, and began to contemplate the lodgings and the guest, I was penetrated with the most profound respect. On entering into conversation with him, I found such vivacity,* and such sweetness in his manner and discourse, that I conceived a strong desire to share his hut and his poverty. Yes, I am fain to confess it, had it been given me to choose my lot among all that the world has to offer, I should have desired no other than that of abiding continually with the man of God, as his servitor.

"After he had welcomed us with gracious kindness, we proceeded to ask him how he employed his time and passed his life in this cell. He replied with that benevolent smile which is habitual to him; 'I do well here, very well. Formerly reasonable beings submitted themselves to my orders; but now, heaven so wills it, that I am obliged to submit myself to a man devoid of common sense.' This he said in reference to a conceited kind of fellow, a quack who had boastfully engaged to cure him, and to whose charge he had been committed by the bishop and chapter. We sat at table with him, expecting to find him under the strictest regimen for the re-establishment of a health so precious to the world; but when we saw him served, and by the doctor's orders, with viands so coarse and revolting (lumps of rancid butter formed part of the fare), that a hungry person in full health would scarcely be persuaded to touch, we felt indignant, and our vow of silence alone prevented us from treating the aforesaid quack, as a brutish, not to say sacrilegious person. As for the man of God, he was wholly indifferent to these things, appearing to have lost the very power of discriminating the flavor of meats, his stomach being entirely disordered, and incapable of performing its functions. Such was the state in which I found this servant of Christ; such was his manner of life in his solitude: but he was not alone,—God and his holy angels were with him."

* The aspect of St. Bernard, his extreme vivacity, and the fiery energy of his whole manner, as contrasted with the serene and heavenly expression of his countenance, and the angelical purity and dove-like simplicity that beamed in his eyes, (which were scarcely ever spoken of without the addition of the epithet "columbinos"), produced so powerful an impression upon the minds of men, even of those who scarcely saw him and heard nothing more than the sound of his voice, that, as it is related in his life, when a party of Germans came to Clairvaux to see the man of God, they were moved to tears by his discourse, without comprehending the language in which it was delivered.

Bernard grew attached to this separate cell of his, which he was wont affectionately to call *his beloved Jerusalem.* He here found leisure to devote himself to the study and devotion of the holy Scriptures. He was sometimes heard to lament the interruptions to which he was exposed, in the visits of those, whom either an excusable curiosity to see this remarkable man, or the more reasonable desire of profiting by his enlightened counsels, brought to his cell. And yet, in the midst of his laments over such interruptions, he would instantly recollect himself, observing, "That the flame of divine love was not given for our solitary advantage, but also for the enlightening of our neighbor, and that thus to use it, was the most acceptable way of serving God, and imitating the Lord Jesus."

Of St. Bernard's enlightened views respecting monastic life, and of his just appreciation of its true spirit and character, a thousand instances might be adduced. Having found occasion to rebuke the pharisaical spirit of some of the Cistercians, who, for the non-observance of certain external precepts of the Benedictine rule, looked down upon the monks of Clugni with affected contempt, he pointedly observed,—"Remember *God's rule,* which cannot be in opposition to that of the holy Benedict. Forget not, that the kingdom of God is within you,—not in outward things, not in the meat and raiment, but in the virtue of the inner man. He is not a monk, who wears the cowl, but who is clad in the proper raiment of the spirit—piety, charity, and lowliness of mind. And say, is not humility in sables better than arrogance in a monk's habit? True it is, that the outward practices enjoined by the rule are not to be neglected; but the hidden man of the spirit —humility, piety and charity, are the essentials, without which all the rest profiteth nothing."

Speaking of the various religious orders, he observes, "It is well that there should be in the Church a variety in external forms and modes of life, in order to suit the various necessities and circumstances of men; but when the members of these several communities are united by the spirit of love, these differences can be no cause of collision, no motive for a breach of charity. Although a man be a member but of one order, yet is he united to all through love, and therefore participates in the good of all; yea, sometimes with more certainty than the co-operating members; for it may happen that one may undertake an external work in vain,—for instance, if it be not undertaken in a proper intention and in the spirit of love; but a man can never err so long as he truly loves the good." Again: "What will it avail us that our mode of life be austere, our dress simple, our personal labor painful and wearisome, our fastings and watchings continual, if at the same time we indulge a pharisaical vanity in despising others? Unless, indeed, we do our works 'that they may be seen of men.' But the Saviour has declared of such, that they have their reward in this world. Alas! alas for us 'if in this world only we had hope of Christ,' for then indeed should we 'be truly miserable;' yea, 'of all men the most miserable,' if after having taken such pains to be unlike the world, we have but placed ourselves in a situation to receive a smaller recompense, or rather a more severe punishment than the rest of the world. Surely we might have found a pleasanter way to hell than this!"

In the quietude and pure air of his hut on the hill-side, in which Bernard's affectionate associations saw an earthly Jerusalem, his health was improved; but no sooner was he released from the state of surveillance in which he had been placed by the tender solicitude of those who loved and revered him, than together with the duties of abbot he resumed his former austerities. The whole community was animated by his spirit and example. Men of illustrious family, who had formerly played a distinguished part on the theatre of the world, were seen laboring in the sweat of their brow, and bringing to a high state of cultivation, a soil which at first would barely yield them a subsistence. But what could not zeal and perseverance effect, when encouraged by the spirit and led on by the example of their enthusiastic leader?

He raised those hallowed walls; the desert smiled,
And Paradise was open in the wild.

Much as yet remains to be said of the great St. Bernard, and when once with such a man, it is difficult to tear oneself from his presence; and if we consent to close our remarks here, it is only on condition that we be allowed to resume the subject of him, to whom has been conceded the distinctive title of THE LAST OF THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH.

Translated for the U. S. Catholic Magazine.

HISTORY OF THE PAPACY.

Continued from page 367.

THE reign of St. Anicetus, the successor of St. Pius, lasted seven years and nearly nine months. To him is attributed the regulation which forbids ecclesiastics to wear their hair long, but he only renewed the prohibition already made by St. Anaclete, and which came from the apostles. It is said also that he conferred the sacred orders five times, ordained four deacons, seventeen priests and nine bishops. Under his pontificate, the greatest heretics and the greatest saints appeared at Rome; the former infecting it with errors, the latter maintaining the purity of its faith. We must especially notice the heresy of the Gnostics, who, glorying in the name of Christians, abandoned themselves to the most abominable excesses; and unhappily the Pagans, but imperfectly informed on the subject of religion, confounded them with the true Christians, so that this error, joined to their attachment to idolatry, strengthened their aversion to the disciples of Jesus Christ. Nevertheless, a great number of heretics were reclaimed by the testimony that St. Polycarp bore to the doctrine of the Roman Church. This bishop of Smyrna had come to Rome to confer with Pope Anicetus on the proper time of celebrating Easter. At Rome, and throughout the west, it was always celebrated on Sunday; in Asia, on the contrary, they conformed to the custom of the Jews, who celebrated it on the fourteenth day of the first month, on whatever day of the week it fell. Polycarp was the disciple of the apostle St. John, who had made him bishop of Smyrna, and he followed in this respect the tradition which he had received from him. Although he could not persuade Anicetus to alter the custom of the western Church, he ceded to him the honor of offering the holy mysteries in his place, and they separated in peace. St. Anicetus was crowned with martyrdom on the 17th of April, 173.

The 14th of May following, St. Soter, a native of Fondi, in Campagna, was elevated to the chair of Peter. During his pontificate of four years, less nine days, he sent considerable alms to the church of Corinth to aid the persecuted Christians. Dionysius, the bishop of that place, has paid a beautiful tribute to the charity of this Pope and of the Romans. The devil, who had in vain assailed the Church by the lewdness and the disorderly manners of the Nicolaites, Gnostics, and Adamites, then sought to ensnare it by the apparent austerity and hypocritical sanctity of the Montanists, into whose errors, Tertullian, one of the greatest men of Christian antiquity, had the misfortune to fall. The women of this sect having exercised some ecclesiastical functions, St. Soter forbade the deaconesses to touch the pall which covered the chalice, or to offer incense in the Church. It was during the life of this excellent pontiff that the miracle of the *storming* legion took place in the year 174. The Christian soldiers of this legion implored in prayer the aid of heaven for the Roman army, which (then in Germany) was nearly perishing with thirst, there being no

water near the place where they were encamped. Suddenly a rain fell which supplied the Romans with water for themselves and their horses. The enemy, on the contrary, were overwhelmed by a violent hail storm accompanied with thunder. The emperor, Marcus Aurelius, moved by this event, forbade, under pain of death, the further accusation of the Christians, and thus suspended the persecution for some time. Nevertheless, St. Soter was martyred on the 22d of April, 177.

St. Eleutherius, son of Abundius a native of Nicopolis, who had been deacon under Anicetus, commenced, on the 3d of May, a reign of fifteen years and twenty-three days. The first of these years is celebrated by the glorious death of the martyrs of Lyons; from their prison they wrote to the Pope against the heresy of the Montanists, and deputed to him St. Irenæus, a priest who was afterwards bishop. During the reign of Eleutherius, Lucius, king of England, sent an embassy to Rome, to request for his countrymen, a missionary to teach them the Christian religion. He died a martyr in the year 193.

The first of June of the same year, St. Victor I, an African, mounted the pontifical throne, which he occupied during nine years, one month, and twenty-eight days. This Pope wishing all the churches to unite in the solemnities of Easter at the same time, ordered that it should be celebrated by all on the Sunday after the 14th of the month of March, and notwithstanding the objections of the bishops of Asia, who wished to retain the contrary custom, he charged Theophilus, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, to assemble a council and to publish his decree. He even menaced those who disobeyed with excommunication; St. Irenæus, who disapproved of this menace as too severe, and which was not indeed executed, did not, however, reproach him with having exceeded the bounds of his authority. The decision of Victor proves that even then this power was exercised in the Church. The Montanists sought to deceive the Pope, by sending him presents, accompanied by apparently Catholic declarations; misled by their exterior virtues and the severity of their morals, he had addressed to them letters of communion, when Praxeas, who afterwards became himself a heresiarch, having informed Victor of the true state of things, he refused their presents and withdrew his letters of peace. Under the pontificate of Victor arose the heresy of Theodotus the banker, who denied the divinity of Christ, and who was excommunicated by the Pope on that account. The reign of this pontiff, which was closed by his martyrdom in 202, forms the transition from the second to the third age of the Church. This third age commenced with cruelty towards the Christians, because the emperor Severus, who had until then been favorable to them, having suddenly changed, persecuted them so fiercely, from the year 201 until his death, that the reign of Anti-christ was believed to be near; this was the fifth persecution. The most violent tempests which the powers of hell had before excited against the Church were trivial in comparison with that which it suffered in the third age. The most common instruments of death were the wooden horse, the rack, gibbets, iron nails, boiling cauldrons and blazing furnaces. But if the cruelty of the executioners, and the torments which they used, strike us with horror, the constancy of the martyrs excites our admiration and instructs and humbles us. Notwithstanding all the persecutions inflicted on the Christians, their number was so great from the commencement of this age, that Tertullian did not hesitate to say in his *Apology*, that had they withdrawn to another country, they would have left Rome a frightful solitude—the Pagan priests also complained of the diminution of their revenues and the desertion of their temples. Indeed, how could they be frequented? There was not a Christian who could not draw from the possessed the confession that the true God was the God of the Christians, and Tertullian offered to make the trial before the magistrates. "*And if these gods,*" said he, "*do not confess that they are devils, if they dare to lie before a Christian, punish that Christian as an impudent imposter.*"

St. Zephyrinus a Roman, who succeeded St. Victor I, on the 28th of August, 202,

reigned seventeen years. His desire of dying for Jesus Christ did not make him unmindful of the wants of his flock, and he accordingly concealed himself during the persecution of the Christians under Severus; but after the death of Plantian, the emperor's father-in-law and the Christians' most bitter enemy, he resumed the public exercise of his functions. This Pope witnessed the sad fall of Tertullian, who became a Montanist in 205, and he was the more afflicted by it because, as St. Jerome relates, it was occasioned by the jealousy of some of the Roman clergy against that great man. In the year 212, the celebrated Origen came to Rome to see this renowned Church. Zephyrinus died the 20th of August, 219: he is said to be the first Pope whose death was not a violent one.

The tranquillity of the Church was in some degree restored by the protection which the emperor Alexander extended to the Christians during the pontificate of St. Callixtus or Callistus I, a Roman by birth, who succeeded Zephyrinus and reigned five years, one month and twelve days. There is even ground for believing that the Christians commenced the building of public temples: thus Callistus built the church at present called "Our Lady's," beyond the Tiber. At least he took advantage of this favorable time to build that subterranean cemetery on the Appian way, known by the name of the Catacombs, where it is said that forty-six Popes and more than one hundred and seventy-four thousand martyrs are interred. The edifying institution of the Ember days is attributed to Callistus, and the prohibition of receiving charges against ecclesiastics from degraded or suspected persons, or known enemies of the accused; a wise precaution calculated to inspire a proper respect for the priesthood. Callistus conferred holy orders five times, ordaining sixteen priests, four deacons, and eight bishops. Notwithstanding the favor which Alexander showed towards the Christians, there were some martyrdoms during his reign, caused by popular excitements, or by the secret persecution exercised by the favorites of the emperor, who did not participate in his sentiments. Callistus himself is a proof of this fact, for he was arrested, and for a long time confined in prison, and was finally thrown into a well, on the 14th of September, 224.

TO BE CONTINUED.

From the Catholic Advocate.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN RUSSIA.

IN the seventh article of its last number, the *Dublin Review* invites the attention of its readers to the late harassing persecutions to which the Catholics of the Russian empire have been subjected by that cruel, tyrannical and intolerant government. The memorable allocution of the present Pope, addressed to the sacred college in the consistory of July 22d, 1842; a work from the pen of an ancient Russian counsellor of state; and yet another from the pen of the learned *Dr. Theiner*, priest of the congregation of St. Philip Neri, giving a "Modern History of the Catholic Church of the Latin and Ruthenian rites," afford the occasion for this interesting article.

The persecution set on foot by the Russian government is less one of violence than of cunning. Unlike that of the ancient pagan emperors, wherein the mask was thrown off, the sword unsheathed, and the poison presented openly, with the avowed purpose of destruction, "it is a covert, artful, disguised hatred,—striking with the golden sceptre of an affected clemency, and dribbling out its hemlock under the name of medicine." It aims less to break down, crush, and destroy the body,

than to weary, pervert, and kill the soul. It does not boldly drag its victims to the dungeon, and send them thence to crimson the scaffold with their blood; but under the pretence of disobedience to its imperial edicts, it smites with sentence of exile the faithful bishops who have wisdom enough to perceive its malignant designs, and courage enough to resist them; and in their place it appoints the time-serving instruments of its own unrighteous policy. The affairs of the Catholic Church are by arbitrary assumption made the business of government, and the matter of imperial legislation, while in all cases the interests of the true Church are sacrificed to the unjust claims of that unholy schism, which recognizes the divine right of the czar to rule the Church of God upon earth. And so general, unsparing and pitiless is the scheme of persecution, that the favor of the Turk and Infidel has been courted, and their cooperation purchased with money, to make the poor Armenians and United Greeks, who are subject to the Porte, groan in unison with the persecuted Catholics of Russia.

A power without restraint, and a tyranny which has no soul to feel, have formed alliance with religious hatred to carry out the underhand, double-dealing, and systematic design of rooting out Catholicity from amid the heterogeneous races which constitute the empire of the autocrat. It is not merely the Catholics of generous, but unhappy, dismembered, crushed Poland, that have suffered from the iron rule of this heartless despot, but wherever, under the vast domains that are cursed with his influence and authority, the poor Catholics exist, there is at work the same intolerant, heartless, and insidious influence for the ruin of faith, and the subjection of conscience to the reign of heresy and schism. The persecution cannot, therefore, be regarded as political, but religious. And those who suffer from the lash of despotism, are not merely martyrs in the cause of patriotism—political martyrs, but in the true sense of the word, they are martyrs to their love of the same precious faith, for which, in primitive times, the Christians were accustomed to suffer and die.

A correct idea of the nature, extent, and horrors of this galling tyranny cannot be gathered from the occasional notices which have appeared in the periodical press. With few intervals of comparative tranquillity it has now endured for near half a century with equal violence. "From the unwomanly reign of Catherine II," says the reviewer, "to that of the present emperor, it has worked with the regularity of a machine, up and down,—ascending to excite hopes, and falling down to crush them,—with unwearying perseverance of evil purpose. Cunning has raised it, that cruelty might better impel it down."

The allocution of the Pope is confined chiefly to the later calamities of the Catholic Church in Russia, without presenting any general survey of those numerous tyrannical acts of which history makes record in preceding years: the French work gives enough of these to arouse indignation and excite sympathy, but "it is too much taken up with doctrinal arguments, and a history of the Greek schism." The work of Dr. Theiner is of more value and interest. "It enters most minutely into details; gives the biography of the principal actors in the scenes which it describes; makes use of local memoirs and rare publications, as well as of official documents, and thus presents a full and comprehensive, as well as painfully finished view of the eventful history of religion in Russia." This last work the reviewer takes as his principal guide.

The reviewer contradicts the very prevalent idea, that "the Church of Russia is an offspring of the schismatical Greek Church of Constantinople, and has been, ever since its origin, separated from the communion of the apostolic see." St. Ignatius was the first patriarch recognized by the Russians—and from his time (A. D. 867) till about 1120, no trace of breach of communion between the Russian Church and the holy see is discoverable, although by Greek forgery, attempts have been made to prove an earlier alienation. With occasional interruptions from 1120, down to the fifteenth century, Russia continued in communion with Rome, so that its separation from the rock of Peter may, with historical accuracy,

be fixed about the opening of the fifteenth century, and was then the product or handiwork of craft, avarice, pride, ambition, and several other vices, as clearly manifested in the conduct of those by whom it was effected. In 1415 a division took place in the Russian Church in consequence of a deposition, by the bishops of a part of Russia, of the worthless patriarch Photias, and an election of Gregory Zamblak in his place. As many bishops still adhered to Photias, the Church was divided into two patriarchates, Photias holding that of Moscow, and Zamblak that of Kiew. These were once more united under Isidore, who had been sent out as metropolitan of both, by Joseph, patriarch of Constantinople. In Kiew, Isidore was well and joyfully received, but not so in Moscow. The Prince Wassili III seized him and cast him into prison, whence, after two years confinement, he escaped to Rome, and died in 1463, patriarch elect of Constantinople. Kiew and Moscow were again separated, the former remaining faithful to the holy see, the latter being schismatical. By the year 1520, however, the efforts of Moscow unhappily prevailed, and all Russia was plunged into the same sad condition.

Shortly after, occurred the disgraceful struggle for the see of Constantinople among four competitors, viz., Jeremias II, Metrophanes III, Pachonius and Theolept. This was one of the most shameful contests for Church preferment, "which has disfigured the annals even of that Church, in which, with the exception of those bishops who kept communion with Rome, the most worthless succession of prelates for centuries held sway." Jeremias succeeded by "gaining the interest of the Porte, through the influence of the Haram," but he exhausted the resources of his see, in paying bribes to effect the ends of his unholy ambition. The poverty of his treasury induced him to journey to Russia in search of contributions. And there, in the Kremlin, he bartered off the patriarchal dignity for a large sum of money, and consecrated Job who had been newly appointed archbishop by the czar. The prince, however, himself claimed the right of investing the new archbishop with the emblems of the patriarchal dignity, and with his own hand put the mitre on his head. The consequences of this simony were, first, "a separation of the southern from the northern bishoprics," and secondly, "a defection of Russia from obedience to Constantinople." This event took place in 1589.

But the brutal tyranny of the monster, Iwan IV, who acted as head of the Russian Church, and in this capacity held ecclesiastical synods, over which he presided and dictated decrees; together with the perceptible progress of those frightful consequences which heresy and schism always bring in their train, had made many of the bishops remember the peace and repose enjoyed by themselves and their flocks while in communion with the holy see, and they began to deplore the existing miseries and sigh again for the return to their former happier condition. They repented, and longed to return to their Father's house. They held an assembly under Michael Rahosa, metropolitan of Kiew, and drew up a declaration of their wishes. This document was dated December 2d, 1594, and signed by the metropolitan, six bishops and an archimandrite. A large body of Ruthenian Christians followed these prelates, and, under the approval of Clement VIII, were re-united to the Catholic Church. But art and violence succeeded, after two hundred years, to sever this union once more.

Those Churches thus re-united are designated by the reviewer, as "the United Greek Church of Russia." When Michael Rahosa had taken this step, "the schismatical archbishop of Moscow, Job, summoned a council, and hurled his impotent censures against the union;" but God blessed the former and smote the latter. Michael enjoyed a peaceful life and tranquil death; Job, having perpetrated crime after crime, and become a mere instrument in the iniquitous hands of the murderer Godunow, whom he crowned as czar, was at length in 1604 imprisoned and strangled. Michael's successor was Joseph Rudski, styled by Pope Urban VIII, "The Athanasius of Russia," who in 1623 was martyred by his enemies. But God rendered

his remains illustrious, making them, like the body of St. John Nepomucen, resplendent with a heavenly light, and permitting various great miracles to take place at his tomb. He was beatified in 1643 by Pope Urban.

We come to the epoch of Peter the Great. This prince, among other designs and achievements which entitle him to this epithet, contemplated and even desired to reunite Russia with the see of St. Peter. He admitted the Jesuits and Capuchins into his states, and in 1717 held correspondence with the divines of the Sorbonne, upon the subject of the *reunion*. In this noble design he was aided by his particular friend, Bishop Stephen Jaworski, who wrote a powerful work called *Petra Fidei*, chiefly extracted from the writings of Bellarmine. At length Peter, in 1720, convoked a meeting of the bishops, and urged the necessity of seeking a union with the holy see. The bishops refused: "Peter solemnly rose up, and with a stern mien pronounced these fatal words: 'I know of no other true and lawful patriarch besides the patriarch of the west, the bishop of Rome, *and as you will not obey him, from henceforth you shall obey me alone.*' And he handed them a statute already prepared, abolishing the patriarchal dignity, and appointing 'the most holy synod' in its place." This synod is a sort of convocation composed of bishops, but presided over by a layman appointed by the czar. Count Pratassow, an officer of the army, is at present the president, or *Ober-Procuror*. This synod is under the control of the president, and claims great prerogatives. A few years since, it pronounced valid and lawful the marriage of the Grand Duke Constantine with a second wife, the first being still alive. The Russian Church is manifestly by this statute, enslaved to the royal will.

This brings the reviewer to a period wherein he is led to divide his subject, to consider under different heads, the history of the United Greeks, and that of the Catholics of the Latin rite. Nothing remarkable in regard to Church affairs, occurred before the accession of Catharine II, in 1762. "This wicked woman, whose participation in her husband's cruel murder, it is almost impossible to doubt—who feared neither God nor man—who believed in nothing, and honored the names of Voltaire and Diderot, beyond those of the holiest men,—of course conformed to the Russian religion, to gain her crown, and became as diligent an observer, as she was a hearty despiser of her new faith." Her religious persecutions are interwoven with her political intrigues.

Her first great conception of crime was a conspiracy with Frederick, the miscalled "great" king of Prussia, against the unfortunate and falling kingdom of Poland. Peter the Great had made the crown of this country hereditary in the house of Saxony. But the two sceptred harpies, who longed to prey on the unhappy country, restored to it the elective form of government, and on the death of the good Augustus III, in 1763, by exerting their joint influence, raised to the throne the weak and inexperienced Stanislaus Poniatowski.

The kingdom of Poland then contained between thirteen and fourteen millions of Catholics, whether of the Latin or Greek rite, and almost four millions of Protestants and Russo-Greeks. To effect their unholy ends against the nationality of Poland, the powers of Russia and Prussia caused their agents to stimulate religious animosity, by demanding for Protestants, not freedom from persecution, for they were not persecuted, not toleration, for they had it, but a perfect equality as regards all offices whatever, from some of which they were excluded. Frederick, among other things, demanded "that the Russo-Greek bishop of Mohilew should have a seat in the senate on equal footing with the Latin prelates." This, with other unreasonable demands, the senate rejected, under the intrepid leadership of Cajetan Soltyk, bishop of Cracow.

Catharine then *unmasked*, ordered forty thousand Russians to advance to the confines of Poland, and sent her emissaries through the country to excite rebellion.

The Polish government stood firm; and so unpalatable were the high-handed measures of these foreign powers to Polanders of all classes and denominations, that while the separated Greeks stood aloof, many of

the Protestants protested loudly against this uncalled for interference.

A new calamity befell the Catholic Church in the death of Ladislaus Lubienski, the venerable and virtuous archbishop of Gnesen, who was succeeded by Count Gabriel Podoski, an irreligious, immoral, reckless, but talented man. "This was the death-blow to the Catholic religion in Poland." And so rejoiced was the "wicked woman," Catharine, at the succession of Podoski, that she forthwith sent him a present of sixty thousand rubles, and, in return, found the archbishop a servile, willing tool, for effecting her evil designs.

Repnin, the active agent of Russia in carrying on these complex, religious and political intrigues, threatened with "attainder, loss of rank, of goods and life," all who held intercourse with those senators who opposed his schemes. Many who incurred suspicion or censure, saw their castles surrounded by soldiers, and were subjected to great annoyances.

The bishop of Cracow, among others, was forced to endure many insults; and after his estates had been plundered and laid waste, he was himself seized while dining in the palace of his friend, Count Meikek, and together with Zaluski, and the two Rzewuski, "was marched off under a guard of two hundred men, into the interior of Russia. On their way they were treated with all possible harshness and severity; and having, to a man, rejected an offer of liberty on condition of their yielding to the imperial will, they were carried in solitary captivity into the heart of Siberia."

A Catholic league, the Confederation of Bar was formed, and the Poles, under the brave and noble Pulawski, determined on self-defence against these acts of high handed tyranny. But the Cossacks and other hordes of barbarians sent against them by Russia, were too numerous and powerful for these brave patriots, and after a few partial successes they beheld their loved country ravaged by the horrors and cruelties of unpitying conquest.

Dr. Theiner gives a startling narrative of the almost incredible atrocities perpetrated by Repnin and his hordes against this much abused and oppressed people. When Bar fell into the hands of the Russian savages, one thousand two hundred men were taken prisoners and sent in chains into Russia. The country was laid desolate, the fields were covered with the slain, "three towns, fifty villages, and many thousand farms were reduced to ashes." Treachery, robbery, murder, and every possible enormity were committed with the approbation of the leaders in this savage and bloody invasion. No mercy was shown to those captured by the Russians, while on the other hand, the manifestoes of the confederates, expressly enjoined that all prisoners taken by the patriot troops should be treated with lenity and kindness.

The Russian Colonel Drewitz may be taken as a type of these savages. This wretch committed the most revolting and unheard of cruelties against the victims whom misfortune placed in his power. Some of his prisoners he bound naked to trees, as targets for the darts and muskets of his barbarians; others he chained together in groups, and amused himself "with having their heads knocked off in a brutally ludicrous way." Of whole troops of them, he caused both hands to be chopped off, and then sent them to wander over the country. Many he flayed alive, and caused their skin to be cut so as to represent the national costume."

When the division of Poland took place, it was with "an express stipulation that the Catholics should remain in full possession of all their ecclesiastical rights." Yet the ink upon this treaty was scarcely dry, before it was violated by a reckless persecution against the Catholics, and especially against the United Greeks, by those of the Russian Church. The monastic possessions were seized, and without pretence to title, were adjudged to the crown. Russian priests invaded the country, and intruded into the livings and churches of the Catholics, and remonstrance only brought further ill treatment.

Then came a second and third division of this ill-fated kingdom. Catharine in the meantime carried on the persecution as against those whom she had already in cap-

tivity, those still remaining in their own country. In 1779 by imperial ukase, she decreed, that "where a parish of United Greeks fell vacant by the death of the incumbent, the congregation should have choice whether they would have a Catholic or Russian priest for his successor." So disastrous and successful was this persecution, that, on authority of Pope Pius VI, it is said "eight hundred churches in a single diocess were taken from the Catholics, and one hundred thousand souls driven to apostacy."

Catharine, to show her good faith and honorable regard for treaties, devised another scheme for injuring the religion of her victims; this was to subject to the jurisdiction of the *Latin primate* of Russia, the archbishop of Molihew, the united Greek Church. This prelate, though nobly descended, "was an unprincipled, haughty, covetous and ambitious man, a declared enemy of the holy see. His name was Stanislaus Siestrezencewicz, and from 1772 till December 1826, he lived to govern his see, and be a disgrace and scourge to the Church. A tool of Catharine, he not only invited but pressed the united Greek priests to pass over to the Latin rite, the effect of which was to drive the people from the churches, where the ritual was now unknown to them, into the schismatical churches, where they saw every thing practised as they had been accustomed to see them. Many in consequence were betrayed into apostacy.

On occasion of the second dismemberment of Poland, the stipulation in behalf of the Catholics had been again introduced into the treaty of 13th July, 1793, known as that of Grodno. But the very same year, Catharine summoned her council in St. Petersburg to debate "the best and most convenient way to bring back the United (Catholics) in late Poland to the profession of the orthodox Greek faith." And a schismatical mission, directed by a Russian bishop, was determined on as the best way, twenty thousand silver rubles being appropriated for this purpose. The missionaries went armed with the knout in place of the cross, and attended by bands of savage Cossacks as co-laborers. Their means were not words of peace, of love, of persuasion, but denunciation, scorn, violence and force. To ensure success, Catharine furnished them with an imperial ukase, requiring that "all families which had joined the Catholic Church since 1595, should be compelled to abandon it;" that churches purporting by the registers to have been originally built by the schismatics should be restored to them; and finally, "that there should be no Catholic Church in any village where there were not a hundred hearths or families." In consequence "about *one half* of the Catholic parishes of Poland were suppressed. A crowd of poor priests were driven out to beg their bread, and thousands of poor people were deprived of the consolations of their religion."

The effect of this *Christian zeal* on the part of the tyrant may be known from the Russian archbishop, who said that "in one year no less than a million of souls were brought back" to the misery of schism.

By the period of the third dismemberment of Poland (October 14th, 1795), the whole of the Catholic Greek diocesses, except Lemberg and Przemysl, had fallen into the hands of Catharine. She suppressed all of them, except the see of Polock, and seized their revenues, except what she gave to reward the zeal of her instruments. Also she suppressed the monasteries of Basilian monks; leaving only a few schools. She ordered the churches, without exception, to be taken from the Catholic clergy, where the people would not apostatize. By an act ludicrously styled "an act of grace," she gave to such priests as would not conform, the choice of exile or retirement on a pension of from fifty to one hundred rubles, equal to two pounds ten shillings, or five pounds a year! A generous offer not accepted by many, the majority having preferred exile.

In the midst of these persecutions Providence cut short the reign of the murderous and impious Catharine.

Paul, the successor of this empress, during his short reign did something to repair the injuries inflicted on the Greek Catholics by Catharine. A legate from the holy see was received, the archbishopric of Polock was confirmed, the bishoprics of Luck and

Breczc restored. The synod, or college for the transaction of ecclesiastical affairs, was re-established. An imperial ukase, breathing a spirit of justice and moderation, was issued also by Alexander I, in 1801. But in 1834 the persecution was again renewed. The reviewer promises at some future time to give us the history of this more recent calamity. In the mean time we may, from the following table, see how much the Catholics have suffered, by observing the frightful loss which took place between 1771 and 1814.

	Parish Churches.
1771,	13,000
1814.—In Russia, 1,388 " Gallicia, 2,296	3,684
Loss,	9,316

	Monasteries.
1771,	251
1814.—In Russia, 91 " Gallicia, 14	105
Loss,	146

	Persons.
1771,	12,000,000
1814.—In Russia, 1,398,478 " Gallicia, 2,136,666	3,535,144
Loss,	8,464,856

Catharine did not treat the Catholics of the Latin rite with near such cruelty as she did those of the Greek. Paul, in agreement with the holy see, appointed new sees for the Greek Catholics, and increased the number of the Latin bishoprics.

"One of the last acts of Alexander's life was to show kindness to the Catholics of both rites, by granting them permission to build new churches."

In conclusion, we must refer our readers to the article from which we have abridged this notice, if they feel an interest in the misfortunes and sufferings of their fellow-members in a distant portion of the Church. The sad picture of violence on the one hand, and heroic endurance on the other, of corruption among the perpetrators of these wrongs, and of weakness also in some who, through fear or ignorance, were estranged from the fold of unity, will awaken at times the most heart-rending sympathy, at other times the glow of indignation and resentment. The genius of liberty has mingled her tears with those of religion in contemplating the wrongs of Poland. The former has toiled amid the waste and ruin of the battle-field to collect the bones of her slaughtered heroes; the latter has sought out amid the same scene of misery for the revered remains of her martyrs. Both will combine to record the history of these misfortunes, and with the eloquent denunciation of truth, consign to the execration of after ages the names of those harpies whose rapacity was the cause of such bloodshed and misery.

It is a consolation too to know that those who suffer persecution will be blessed, while the avenger will, sooner or later, smite the oppressors?

MISSIONS AT THE COLUMBIA RIVER.*

NO. I.

THE two missionaries, Messrs. Blanchet and Demers, left Red River, July 10, 1838, and arrived on the 24th of November, after the fatigues of such a journey, at Fort Vancouver, situated four hundred leagues from the Rocky Mountains, and seventeen hundred and fifty-six from Montreal. In consequence of the arrangement between the bishop of Juliopolis, and Geo. Simpson, the governor of the honorable Hudson Bay Company, the principal station of the missionaries had been fixed at the establishment of Cowlitz, on the river of the same name, because it is not situated as that of Wallamette, whose population is more considerable, in the territory which is

* From unpublished notes of Father DeSmet.

now a subject of litigation between Great Britain and the United States. This post is thirty leagues from Vancouver. The 12th of December, Mr. Blanchet set out to open this mission, where he found some Canadians, formerly employed in the service of the company, whose confessions it was necessary to hear, as well as to confirm their marriages and baptize their children. After some days employment in these functions, he took possession of a fine farm of six hundred acres for the use of the mission. On it a chapel was built, a presbytery of forty-five feet by thirty. The colonists are much pleased in having the missionaries established among them. The whole district is in a suitable condition to receive emigrants; the climate is mild, the soil fertile, hay, game, and fish abundant. January, 1839, was employed in founding a mission at the establishment of Wallamette, on a river of the same name, at the south of Columbia, and twenty-two leagues from Vancouver. The good Canadians of that post had come out to meet the missionaries, whom they were desirous to retain among them. In this hope they had built a chapel with a presbytery, of seventy feet in length by thirty. The first mass was said at Wallamette on the 6th of September, 1839, in the presence of the assembled Canadians, their wives and their children. What a happy day for them!

The recitation of prayers commenced after mass, and continued until noon, and again commenced at one o'clock, and finished at four in the afternoon. A part of the time was employed in explaining the creed and the great truths of religion. But these women and children did not all understand French, and besides there was a diversity of languages among them, according to the different countries from which they had come; some speaking the language of the savages called Flat Heads, who inhabit the vicinity of Fort Colville; others that of Tchinouk, living towards the lower part of Columbia river. Two interpreters were therefore necessary. . . . . The time of instruction continued three weeks, during which many women and children were taught to make the sign of the cross, to offer their hearts to God, and to say the *Pater*, *Ave*, and *Credo* in their own language. In the evening prayers were recited, and pious lectures read to the people, or some edifying narratives were related, with the chanting of hymns, and the recital of the responses of the mass. The missionary profited by this time to give reading lessons in French to some young people, the most of whom knew how to read in English. For want of a schoolmaster, the missionary was obliged to attend to every thing, until more favorable circumstances arose. The children who are able to read French will be of service to the mission during the absence of the priest.

After three weeks' instruction, the missionary administered the sacraments of baptism and matrimony. Twenty-five Indian women were baptized in most excellent dispositions, and were married. One poor woman, having been instructed on death, left the world in two days after. An old savage who was also sick and in danger of death, and a young woman in the same state were baptized; the young female died in two days, and the old man soon followed her to the tomb. Both were interred in the same ground. What would have become of these unfortunate beings, but for the missionary's assistance? In the space of a month the missionary performed seventy-four baptisms, and twenty-five marriages, and heard the confessions of all the adults, even of those who had not received baptism, to accustom them to this duty. A marriage made without the certainty that the first wife of the husband was dead, was annulled, and a separation of the parties required, which was acceded to. Canticles were required to be sung at the morning and evening prayers, the missionaries having witnessed the happy results of this practice from the time of their arrival at Vancouver.

M. Blanchet visited all the establishments on the river Wallamette, and every where he was received with great demonstrations of joy by the colonists. He has taken possession of the country intended for the mission, which consists of a piece of land, measuring thirty-one by one hundred and forty-seven acres.

At Vancouver the missionaries began by reciting the evening prayers in common with the people; and they intend to continue this good practice. Mr. Demers was able, in a short time, to acquaint himself with a certain language called *Jargon* (or Gibberish) in the country, by means of which he is enabled to instruct the savages. They are obliged to repeat the catechism twice every day, once before noon, and then again in the evening. On the 20th of February there were not less than one hundred and fifty savages at prayers in the evening, and the number cannot fail to increase. He generally teaches catechism twice a day in French, at one time to the woman and little girls at the fort, many of whom know their prayers well enough to say their beads. The practice of this devotion, in honor of the immaculate Queen of heaven, was commenced at Columbia from the first arrival of the missionaries. Mr. Demers has already distributed fifty pairs of beads. The catechism is also taught to the women and children of the surrounding country.

Whilst Mr. Demers is instructing savages in the evening, Mr. Blanchet attends to the Canadians, who are occupied during the day at their work, and teaches the young men how to read in French, the most of them being able to read English. He also teaches them the responses of the mass and the plain chant. After these exercises, which continue until nine o'clock at night, the missionary hears the confessions of the laboring people, whose occupations do not permit them to present themselves during the day. It is easy to perceive that they are not unemployed.

Fort Vancouver is situated on the north of Columbia, thirty-three leagues from the Pacific ocean. It contains seventy-six Canadians in the service of the establishment. There are about three hundred savages living in the vicinity. During the fourteen years that Dr. McLaughin has been governor, he has rendered the most important services to the Canadians in a religious point of view. In a school supported at his own expense, are taught the catechism and the chant of the sacred canticles. To this estimable man religion owes every thing that the missionaries have been able to accomplish at Vancouver.

The company possesses twenty-eight establishments to the west of the Rocky Mountains to carry on the fur trade with the savages. Three hundred whites, almost all Catholics, are employed in the service of these establishments. This number, joined to the settlers at Cowlitz and Wallamette, and some other people, who are engaged in the chase in the southern prairies, including therein women and children, form already a Catholic population of about nine hundred souls. The number of the savages who frequent the instructions to prepare themselves for baptism, is about one hundred and fifty, and cannot fail to increase, if we may judge from the favorable dispositions shown towards the missionaries, by the greater part of the infidel natives of this country.

TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

(REGINA CŒLI LÆTARE.)

Oh! Queen of heaven, lift up thy voice,
And with triumphant love rejoice;
For He, whom thou deserv'dst to bear,
As mother, yet as Virgin fair,
Has, as he said he would, arisen;—
Oh! Maiden Mother, Queen of heaven,
Rejoice, and for us intercede,
Thy God, thy Son, has risen indeed.
Alleluia! M. C. A.

INTELLIGENCE.

FOREIGN.

Rome.—A family of Israelites were baptized at Rome, on the 19th of February, by the Cardinal Vicar Patrizi. The baron and baroness of Pfeffer stood sponsors for the parents; the Count and Countess Mareschalchi for the children.

Belgium.—*Carmelite Order.*—In a recent letter from Belgium we find the following statistical information, relative to the religious order of Mount Carmel, a society distinguished alike for its antiquity, the austerity of its rule, and the number and sanctity of its members. Within the limits of Belgium, although the territory is comparatively small, there are thirteen monasteries for ladies, and another is soon to be established, all of which are subject to the government of the congregation of Italy. The Fathers of the order, by reason of their suppression and long continued sufferings and persecutions, had nearly all been carried off by the hand of death; but now, under the kind protection of Providence, they have again commenced to increase their numbers. Amidst many calamities, the Lord had preserved three venerable fathers, who re-established the order and successively governed it. As soon as some excellent subjects presented themselves as candidates to be admitted into the order, they were sent to Rome, there to imbibe the primitive spirit of the rule. These, afterwards returned to their native country. The present father provincial is one of that band of youths, and his labors in the direction of the houses of the order are blessed with the most consoling results.

During the course of last year the provincial visited Rome, in order to assist at the election of the new superior general. The father chosen is a native of Piedmont; his name in religion is Father Clement of St. Theresa. The present summer, he intends to make, in person, the visitation of all the monasteries of his congregation.

The daughters of St. Theresa seem more than ever influenced by the laudable and holy zeal of propagating their order and maintaining its original fervor and austerity; and this too, not only in Belgium, but throughout the kingdom of France. There, during the rampant fury and horrors of the first revolution, all the religious houses had been suppressed; the monasteries either destroyed, or turned to secular purposes; and the members of the communities, driven from their sacred, peaceful asylums, spilled their blood in the wholesale massacres, which then occurred, or were scattered through the different countries of the civilized world. God, however, in his own good time, bid the storm cease, and brought peace to his persecuted children: within the last thirty years, the religious orders have again been established, and there are now flourishing, in their primeval discipline and sanctity, upwards of one hundred communities of Carmelites. It is truly consoling to see religion thus resuming its ground and influence in countries in which it had been subjected to the ordeal of the most violent persecution. May we not cherish the hope, that Spain, ere long, seeing the folly and criminality of her mad conduct towards the religion of her people, will retrace her steps, and become what she was formerly, the most chivalrous and Catholic nation of the world.

France—*Conversion of an Israelite*—A touching ceremony took place on the 14th of May last, at Verquières, in the diocess of Aix. We allude to the abjuration and baptism of M. Isaac Cohen, a learned Israelite, the son of a rabbi of the synagogue of Carpentras. M. Cohen was considered among his brethren as descended from the tribe of Levi,—the sacerdotal race. A doctor among his people, and initiated in the Holy Scriptures by a profound knowledge of the Hebrew language, he renounced his religion only after the most serious reflection. For twenty years he had been meditating this important step, and finally was thoroughly converted by reading the works of Bossuet, and now says if the Israelites will only read Bossuet they will come in flocks into the folds of the Church. M. Cohen astonishes every one by his thorough knowledge of the Bible, which he has studied in the original text, and especially of the prophecies, which he interprets as learnedly as the doctors of our Church. A large concourse assembled to assist at the pious solemnity of his reception, and to express their joy at his conversion. It was enough to move one to tears to see the baptismal water falling on his venerable head blanched by the snows of sixty-seven winters, and one could not refrain from thanking God for his mercy.

May this example, together with that of M. Ratisbonne and the more recent ones of MM. Bluen, a physician of Strasbourg, and Moses Rocca, a physician of Trieste, make the Israelites comprehend that their salvation can be found only in God's new temple, which is the Church, in which the promises announced by Abraham have been accomplished for eighteen centuries.—*Mélanges Religieux.*

Conversion.—A letter from Chalons says:—"Miss Andresen, a Danish lady, witnessed, on the 22d of May last, in the church of Damery, the public abjuration of the errors of Calvinism by a young lady of Calcutta. This example made a deep impression on Miss Andresen, and induced her to examine and ultimately to renounce the errors of Lutheranism, to which she was previously attached. After having received unconditional baptism, she approached the holy table, in company with many of the faithful, with a fervor truly angelical."—*Prop. Catholique.*

England.—*Puseyism.*—The proceedings at the annual meeting of the Catholic Institute, held in London, on Monday, Lord Camoys in the chair, present some disclosures which have excited no little astonishment. In the course of his address Lord Camoys said: "Look at the controversy now going on in the established Church, especially at Oxford. [Cheers.] There was one regius professor (Dr. Pusey) just condemned and suspended for having advanced the doctrine of the real presence in the eucharist; whilst another regius professor of the same university (Dr. Hampden) had been subjected to an action for damages for his maintenance of an entirely opposite doctrine. [Loud ironical cheers.] Now, if the action were to terminate against Dr. Hampden, he thought that the University of Oxford would be in what the Americans were accustomed to call a "fix." [Cheers and loud laughter.] He had heard at one of the meetings of that Institute a hope expressed that they (the Roman Catholics) might live to see the day when high mass would be celebrated in Westminster Abbey. [Tremendous cheering.] He knew not how probable such an event might be, but this they knew, that the doctrine of the mass had been preached in the cathedral of the University of Oxford [loud cheering]; and it had been authoritatively declared that if Dr. Pusey's sermon had not been condemned (as we understood the noble lord), six or seven colleges of Oxford University were ready to have mass said directly. [Tremendous cheering and applause, in which the voice of a boy in the gallery was very distinctly audible.] There was indeed a very slender barrier between Puseyism and the Church of Rome; and O! what a field was now presented for the Roman Catholics to demolish that slender barrier at once, and to restore this great country to that Catholic union which was so exceedingly desirable! [Vociferous cheering.]

Hint to Puseyites.—We endorse the following anecdote from the *Western Christian Advocate*, a Methodist paper, though in a different spirit from what is there manifested. "Fuller, in his ecclesiastical history, relates of Laud, that having once demanded of a lady who had lately become a proselyte to Popery, the reason of the change, he received for answer that 'she hated a crowd.' Upon being farther pressed to explain so dark a saying, she said: 'Your lordship and many others are making for Rome as fast as you can, and therefore, to prevent a press, I went before you.'"

Tractarian Ceremonies.—An English journal, commenting on this subject, says: "We have just received one or two communications upon this subject, which is now exciting very great attention in the Church. In another part of our paper we give extracts from an article in the *Quarterly Review*, which also treats upon it. We have, moreover, had described to us by an eye-witness the scene which occurred in one of the churches of the metropolis, on Sunday last, during the performance of the morning service. The altar is adorned with a large wooden crucifix in the centre, and two huge wax tapers in massive silver candlesticks, and covered with little golden chalices with opercula, patines in gold and silver, traverses for waters, bows for offerings, corporal cloths, and other *gew-gaws*. The whole of the internal arrangements of the church are also made to conform as closely as possible to those of a *Romish mass-house;* and the many deviations, in the reading of the services, from the established usages of the Church of England, were all in the direction of the Pontifical and Missal. Many additions to the rubric of the prayer book were described to us. We notice one or two of the most remarkable of them. The two clergymen who officiated were attended throughout the entire service by a boy in a surplice. This, we need scarcely remark, is borrowed altogether from the Roman Catholic ceremonial: he is called in their service books the *Acolyth* or *Altar-boy*. On ascending the pulpit-stairs, the incumbent of the church was observed to kneel on two or three successive steps in the course of his ascent, remaining for a few moments in silent prayer on each of them. He was doubtless reciting that portion of the mass-service which is called the *Graduale*. At the conclusion of the sermon, and during the reading of the sentences,

four velvet bags were taken from a silver salver, which stood upon the altar, and carried round the church by as many lay devotees to collect the offerings. The bag (*sacculus*) is used for this purpose in the Romish ritual, and nowhere else. On presenting the offerings, the layman made a profound reverence to the curate, who stood within the altar rail, holding the salver to receive the bags. Having done this, they made a genuflection towards the altar with the arms folded over the chest, uttering certain words (no doubt, *mea culpa, mea culpa*) in a low tone, and at the same time smiting the chest with the right hand, the well known *Romish* practice which the martyr-fathers of our Church of England reprehended so severely three hundred years ago, under the homely description of "kneeling and knocking."—*English Protestant Paper.*

The British papers announce another convert to Catholicity. The Rev. George Talbot, M. A., formerly of Baliol college, has resigned the living of Evercreech-cum-Chesterblade, Somerset, and joined the Church of Rome. This is said to be the FIFTH Tractarian member of the University of Oxford who has turned Catholic since the conversion of the Rev. R. W. Sibthorpe.

A Baptist preacher and four other converts made their first communion at Easter-week in the Catholic Church of Shrewsbury, England. The pastor had nineteen other converts under instruction. An eligible site had been purchased in the same town for a new church.

Roman liberality and Oxonian bigotry.—A few years ago, I visited St. Peter's church in Rome, and among the master-pieces of art which adorn that wonder of the world, I was somewhat surprised to learn that the mausoleum of Pope Pius VII had been executed by a Protestant sculptor, Thorwaldsen, the well known Phidias of Denmark. Expressing my astonishment to a dignified Italian clergyman, he replied, that really that circumstance did not occur to him before as any thing very remarkable; that his countrymen were in the habit of attending more to the talent than to the religion of the artist in matters appertaining to the fine arts. The good sense of the observation struck me most forcibly on reading in the *Sun* newspaper of Tuesday last, that "Important alterations are to be made in some of the colleges of Oxford University. Baliol is to undergo a thorough repair, the direction of which was intrusted to Mr. Pugin, the celebrated Catholic architect. The master of the college objected to the employment of this gentleman, and Mr. Pugin's engagement is consequently broken off.—*Correspondent of the Prior Park, Bath.*

The Very Rev. Father Mathew and the Holy Bible.—The apostle of temperance has addressed the following interesting letter, in answer to a most singular charge uttered against him by a Mr. Seymour, at a recent meeting in England. This veracious gentleman, among other things, charged this great and good man with having preferred the gew-gaws, or trumpery of medals and ribands, to the Holy Bible. It is a most curious circumstance, as the writer of these lines well knows, that for weeks before this foul slander had been uttered, the apostle of temperance had actually in the most marked manner arranged with Messrs. Coyne and Battersby, of Dublin, to print and publish the Catholic version of the Holy Bible, as recommended by all the bishops of Ireland, in such a manner, and on terms so low, that not only almost every teetotaller, but every Catholic in the three kingdoms may have a copy of the Divine Volume. The first issue of the Bible is to commence on the 17th of next month.—"To John W. Green, Esq., London.—Dear Sir—The letter of your amiable correspondent, dated Durham, addressed to William Digby Seymour, Esq., has afforded me much gratification. I thank him for his vindication of me and the Irish Temperance Society from, to use the mildest term, the unkind sneer of that young gentleman, whom I forgive, as readily as my good friend of Durham; and would to God that William Digby Seymour would as readily forgive him, whose feelings he has so deeply and carelessly wounded. I have never advocated temperance as a substitute for the eternal Gospel. God forbid! I have from my own private resources, without ever soliciting a shilling of public aid, distributed some thousand copies of the Douay version of the Holy Bible; and with the approbation of the Most Reverend the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland, I have in the press a new edition of the sacred volume, to be *published in twelve numbers, at the low price of 6d. each number.* This will place the Old and New Testament within the reach of almost every head of a family in Ireland. *If I had pecuniary resources equal to my wishes, every one of the six millions of teetotallers in this kingdom, would have a copy of the blessed book before the end of the present year.* I shall only say to this romancing countryman of mine, what the celebrated William Cobbett said to an old gentleman of New York, who was exhibiting in a discourse some antiquated trumpery: 'Sir, you ought to have been born two hundred years ago.'—Believe me, dear Mr. Green, yours devotedly,

THEOBALD MATHEW.

"CORK, *May* 28, 1843."

SCOTLAND.—*Pentecost in Edinburgh.*—The *Edinburgh Courier*, speaking of the emptiness and desertion of the established churches in the Scotch metropolis on this great feast, thus describes the Catholic Churches on the same occasion:—"On turning to the Catholic Church—to St. Margaret's—St. Patrick's—and St. Mary's—there he would have found the spirit of truth, unity, and devotion. There was some difficulty in getting through the crowd at the door of St. Mary's; but, on entering, the sight was magnificent. The entire body of the church was completely filled, the three aisles being lined with military. Advancing up the centre aisle, through their open ranks, the richness of the altar decorations exceeded any thing ever witnessed in Edinburgh, perhaps even in Catholic times.

Hawick, Selkirk, Kelso, &c.—About six years ago, the Rev. W. Wallace accidentally turned his attention to the small manufacturing town of Hawick, where he found nearly two hundred Catholics—such exemplary Catholics, too, that even the public authorities of the place did them the justice to say that a Catholic had never been brought before them, even for a *misdemeanor*; yet there they were in a place where the feet of a Catholic clergyman had not trod since the devastating fire of the Reformation; and thus they might have been till the devastating fire of the last day reduced their neighbors to a level with them, if Providence had not led the above clergyman to visit and pity them. That which has been said here of Hawick, may in like manner be said of Setburgh, Selkirk, Kelso, Galashiels, and Peebles—in every one of which, were there a chapel, there would be a flock; yet it is well known that, with the exception of Traquair, there is not even a station from Edinbugh to Carlisle, a distance of more than ninety miles. In none of these places is there any hostile feeling to Catholics. But Hawick has the singular commendation that in it not only is there no hostile feeling, but, on the contrary, there is a strong and marked feeling in favor of Catholicity. Though a priest, and a total stranger, the Rev. Mr. Wallace found himself caressed, encouraged, and even supported by the most influential persons in the place. More than one of the best citizens of the town have even promised to *take seats in the church*, which is now begun; and if a charitable public would aid him to complete the shell, the earl of Traquair has nobly volunteered to seat it, and the Protestant inhabitants have signified their intention to aid, if not to defray, the necessary sum for purchasing an organ. *Tablet.*

DOMESTIC.

ARCHDIOCESS OF BALTIMORE.—*Ordinations.* At the Cathedral, on the 14th and 15th of July, the Most Rev. Archbishop conferred the orders of subdeacon and deacon on Henry Toppert and Herman Blatte, of the Society of the Most Holy Redeemer; and on Sunday, the 16th, in St. James' church, the same candidates were raised to the holy order of priesthood. At the same time, minor orders were conferred on Frantz Schugg, Frantz Seelos, and Karl Hofer.

At Georgetown, on the 2d of July, James Aloysius Ward, John Ev. Blox, Charles Henry Stonestreet, William Francis Clarke, and William Michael Logan were ordained sub-deacons by the Most Rev. Archbishop Eccleston, and on the 3d of the same month, deacons, in the chapel of the Visitation Convent. On the 4th July, they were elevated to the honor of priesthood by the same prelate in Trinity church, with much solemnity, before a large congregation, who were much impressed and edified with the whole ceremonial.

Confirmation.—The sacrament of confirmation was administered in St. Matthew's Church, Washington, D. C., on Sunday, 2d of July last, to two hundred and thirty persons, of whom eighty were converts from Protestantism.

In Georgetown, D. C., one hundred and thirteen persons, of whom eight were converts, received the same sacrament on the 15th of June last, at Trinity Church.

Sale of Pews in the Cathedral.—Through the great energy and zealous exertions of the Rev. Mr. Coskery, a sale of Pews heretofore vacant in the Cathedral, has at length been effected, and a material addition to the revenues of our metropolitan church has been thereby supplied. On the eleventh of July last, forty-two pews were offered at public sale in the cathedral, and were sold at prices yielding an annual rent of four hundred and forty-seven dollars, and averaging a fraction over ten dollars a pew.

This result, though encouraging to those who feel an interest in the pecuniary affairs of the cathedral, and highly creditable to the reverend gentleman whose influence and efforts contributed so largely to effect it, should rather stimulate than satisfy the zeal of those who feel anxious for the temporal prosperity of the Church in Baltimore. Great exertions are still necessary to meet the heavy and pressing demands against the church. Every member of the Cathedral flock should give his monthly mite in aid of the "Sinking Fund Society." If properly sustained by the Catholics of Baltimore, the society is destined to effect an important and salutary change in the condition of the cathedral debt.

Donations also should still be looked to as among the ways and means which will greatly assist us in our present difficulties. Many of our congregation made a liberal response to a recent and urgent call in behalf of the church, while others, well able to contribute, have as yet held back; some, perhaps, for good reasons, and some, we fear, upon very visionary pretexts. Unwise management, say some, has brought your difficulties on you, and therefore we will not assist you to shake them off. We hardly know that we ought to stop to consider such an objection. It is an excuse by which we may regulate future operations, but is a poor way to cure what is past and done. It is a subterfuge very similar to that used by the repudiators of state liabilities who are unwilling to pay for acts which, as they allege, they disapproved at the time of their passage. It is an excuse similar to that by which some citizens during the late war sought to justify their denial of aid in its behalf. There are, we believe, some men who think if their opinions or counsels do not prevail on the policy of any given project, that they are commendable for withholding all assistance in promoting its objects, be those objects of a religious or social character. There are others, who, though their church solaces and assists them, think they owe nothing to its maintenance, and that what they give, if they give at all, is a wonderful gratuity, or the offering, not of obligation, but of charity. To be sure they would tell you it would be sinful not to pay the quota levied on you for the support of social order, or to protect your homes from foreign invasion; but when the question is one of voluntary tax, equally binding in conscience (and in all Christian countries but America binding even in law), for the decent support of religion, you are politely told that civil obligations must be looked to first,—the crumbs and fragments that may be gathered after our wants and comforts are all supplied, we will give to our needy and distressed mother, the Church. There never was a more mistaken rule of conduct, and we say to all such, you are as much bound, in proportion to your means, to sustain the religion that you practice, and that serves you, as you are to uphold the plighted honor of your state, or to bear arms in support of your country. For what are any taxes but equivalents paid to the power taxing us for the service which it renders us. And if we consider our indebtedness by this rule of equivalents, if we measure what we owe by value received, the most of us, we fear, will be found in heavy arrears to our church; for while many of us have received no individual civil benefit corresponding with the proportion of the civil burden imposed upon us, we have all experienced from our Church much spiritual assistance, and from her ministers constant care and an apostolic readiness to supply our many and frequent wants, to obey our summons for spiritual relief, be the same made at the midnight hour, or from the remotest part of our city and its vicinage.

Diocess of Boston.—*Grand celebration of the laying of the corner stone of the College of the Holy Cross, in Worcester, Mass.*—On Wednesday morning last, the 21st day of June, 1843, the new college was commenced by laying the corner stone. The Rt. Rev. Bishop Fenwick, the Rev. Charles Constantine Pise, D. D., accompanied by the Rev. Mr. M'Closky, of St. Joseph's church, New York; the Very Rev. William Tyler, vicar general of the diocess of Boston; Rev. Messrs. Hardy and Rolof, of the Cathedral; Rev. Mr. Flood, of St. Mary's, Boston; Rev. Mr. Goodwin, of Charlestown; Rev. Mr. Lynch, of Roxbury; Rev. Mr. Fitzpatrick, of East Cambridge; Rev. Mr. Conway, of Lowell; Rev. Mr. Strain, of Walthan; and Rev. Mr. Wiley, of Providence; all departed in a special train of cars for Worcester, accompanied by a large concourse of the citizens of Boston and several distinguished strangers.

On their arrival at the rail road station in Worcester, they were received by the Rev. Messrs. Mulledy and Fitton of Worcester, together with a crowd of the inhabitants, who greeted the Rt. Rev. Prelate and his Rev. associates on their arrival at that flourishing place. A band of music was in attendance at the public square, and the "Catholic Temperance Society," together with the "Young Men's," and "Young Ladies' Society" attached to the Sunday school of Rev. Mr. Fitton's church of Worcester, appeared with their appropriate banners on the spacious green. The day was beautiful—the sky clear—the atmosphere refreshing and invigorating—and the sun shed its noon-day lustre over every hill and valley for miles around.

The Rev. Messrs. Mulledy and Fitton formed the order of the procession, and the whole moved in the direction of the college site, distant about two miles. The band played "Adeste fideles," and "Hail Columbia;" and the star spangled banner of America could be seen in the distance waving triumphantly on the Alpine like heights of the romantic site, and the roaring noise of the cannon was heard throughout the town and adjacent country for almost an hour during the progress of the splendid procession. The procession was nearly one mile in length, and the ladies of Worcester graced the moving

throng with their presence. On arriving near the brow of the college ground, the superintendant, Mr. Boland, had already constructed arbors and shady groves for the accommodation of the visiters and youth now assembling. In the residence attached to the old seminary, the Rt. Rev. Bishop Fenwick and all the clergymen of the Catholic Church arrayed themselves in surplices; the bishop wearing his mitre and crosier. Here the most imposing and sublime part of the procession was formed, and as the glorious banner of the effulgent cross appears in front of the ecclesiastical body, and as the sacred notes of a solemn chaunt echoed along the breeze of the valley, amid the sound of artillery and beneath the stars and stripes of our beloved country, I felt proud of the magnificent scene; I felt proud of the worthy occasion of laying the first corner stone of the first Catholic college in New England: and I could not but rejoice for the civil and religious liberties we enjoy in a land hitherto known for its religious intolerance and religious persecution.

After the laying of the corner-stone, and depositing several coins and newspapers of the day, together wth a record of the names of the officers of state, the procession moved around the foundation walls of the "College of the Holy Cross," and the Rt. Rev. Bishop blessed them in the usual manner. After reciting the *Veni Creator*, the Rev. Dr. Charles Constantine Pise, of New York, ascended the platform erected for the occasion and beautifully decorated with evergreen boughs. At this moment thousands of spectators gathered around the orator's stand, and covered the neighboring heights, in vehicles and on foot, in order to hear the reverend orator pour forth his lofty strains of eloquence. The reverend speaker paid a high compliment to the people of this commonwealth for their enthusiastic admiration of the arts and letters, and their ardent love for national education. He then reviewed and explained the history of the Jesuit Society from its origin to the present day, and paid a merited compliment to the generous hearted Bishop Fenwick, who has bestowed on his diocess as a legacy, the new college of the Holy Cross. The reverend orator then alluded to the indefatigable exertions of the Very Rev. Dr. Mulledy, S. J., formerly president of Georgetown College, under whose auspices the erection of this edifice has been commenced, and into whose hands it will be intrusted. He concluded his oration by invoking the blessings of Almighty God for the perpetuity and success of the college, destined to rear up Catholic youth and send them forth into the busy world adorned with the gems of a well educated mind, and possessed with a soul inspired for every virtue calculated to ennoble and to elevate the condition of the human family.

At two o'clock, P. M., the bishop and clergymen, together with several distinguished strangers from Boston and Worcester, amounting to about seventy, sat down to a collation prepared for the occasion by the worthy and zealous pastor of the Church in Worcester—Rev. James Fitton. It was truly a feast in the evergreen bower. At the conclusion we gave three enthusiastic cheers for the bishop and orator of the day.

The new building will be one hundred and four feet long and fifty feet wide, four stories high, and capable of accommodating one hundred students. There is also a very neat frame building, two stories high and one hundred feet long, already finished, and the whole forms a capacious and splendid establishment. There are sixty acres of rich land attached to the college, and around the base of the college mountains there is a beautiful river suitable for bathing, fishing, sailing or skating. The college stands on an eminence of three hundred feet above the town level, and commands a panoramic view of the surrounding country for upwards of twenty miles. Worcester is situated forty-two miles west of Boston, and the journey from Boston is made in the short space of two hours, over the Great Western Rail Road which connects Lake Erie with Casco Bay.

Boston Pilot.] J. D. S.

Diocess of Mobile.—*New Catholic Cathedral.*—We are glad to perceive, by a notice of a meeting, in another column, that the Catholic congregation of this city have taken this matter in hand. We have been surprised that a building, so much needed in the city, and one that would redound so much to our credit in its appearance and in the way of architecture, should have been left so long uncompleted. The foundation was laid some six or seven years ago. We hope soon to see its walls starting up like magic.—*Mobile Daily Advertiser.*

Diocess of New York.—*The Bible-burning.* The following is the report of the committee, composed of Catholics and Protestants, appointed to investigate the burning of a number of Bibles at Corbu, last November. It will be in the recollection of our readers, that the Protestant press of this country bellowed forth the usual denunciatory invectives against Catholics and their religion on the reception of this intelligence, and it remains to be seen whether it will extend to us what justice demands—the publishment of this report which places the subject in its true light:

"*Report.*—The undersigned, in compliance with a request of the Rev. J. Roony of Plattsburgh, and in conformity to the wishes of Bishop Hughes of New York, as published in the papers, met at Corbu in the town of Champlain, for the purpose of ascertaining the facts in relation to the burning of Bibles at that place in November last.

"After having examined a number of witnesses, we have to report that Bibles were burnt, and that the number will not vary much from forty-two—we think that to be the precise number. They were burnt by Mr. Telman, a missionary from Canada, and recently from France, a Friar oblat—that Mr. Telman was the sole instigator and mover in the business of burning Bibles, and in opposition to the wishes and feelings of Mr. Durgas, the resident clergyman at Corbu. It appears that the number burnt was but a small proportion of the whole number distributed among the people. These Bibles were given to the Catholics by Protestant agents of the Bible Society, and in some cases were left with individuals, after an expression of repugnance to receive them, and but a small number of those who gave up their Bibles to be burned, could read at all.

It appeared in testimony that the bishop of Corbu five days after the above transaction, had expressed in strong language his disapprobation of the whole affair.

Therefore, in view of the above facts and circumstances, we have arrived at the conclusion that whatever odium or blame there is in this transaction, it belongs to Mr. Telman; and that it would be uncharitable and unjust to throw it upon the whole denomination.

Eben'r A. Scott,	*Protestants.*
Hiram Ladd,	
David Parsons,	
Mich'l Haggerty,	*Catholics.*
John Riley,	
Patrick Moffitt,	

N. E. Reporter.

Exciting Ordination Scene in the Episcopal Church.—Eleven young men were on Sunday ordained at St. Stephen's Church, by the Rev. Bishop Onderdonk. The service was read by the Rev. Dr. Berrien, and the sermon was preached by the bishop. After he had concluded the eleven candidates stood around the altar, when he announced, as is customary, that he was about to ordain them, and requested that if there were any person or persons who had any objections to make, or knew aught against them, they would now announce the same. A moment of silence ensued, when the Rev. Hugh Smith, of St. Peter's, rose in the middle aisle, and stated that he had by letter yesterday informed the bishop that he should protest against the ordination of one of the candidates, Mr. Carey, in consequence of his holding opinions favorable to *Romanism;* and he did now accordingly protest. When he sat down, the Rev. Mr. Anthon, of St. Mark's church in this city, who had been sitting in the same pew with Mr. Smith, also rose, and in like manner protested against the ordination of Mr. Carey, for the same reason.

Bishop Onderdonk stated that he had received the objections of the reverend gentlemen, and had in consequence appointed six competent and worthy persons to examine into the charge which had been made against Mr. Carey, and that they had unanimously reported to him that it was unfounded; and that also was his own conviction, and that he should proceed to ordain all the candidates. He then commenced reading the prayer, and during the ceremony Messrs. Smith and Anthon both rose and left the church.

It is supposed that the objections to the ordination of Mr. Carey arose from the idea that he held an opinion similar to those promulgated in the celebrated Oxford Tracts, and for which Dr. Pusey has been recently suspended in England. It is, indeed, a continuation of the same controversy which has divided the Episcopal Church on the other side of the Atlantic.—*Express.*

The above protest of Messrs. Smith and Anthon, shows that private *interpretation* of Episcopal doctrine is not, in their opinions, very palatable at least when it savours of "Romanism." To us it would appear that this attack upon the opinions of Mr. Carey has a more Catholic feature about it than the opinions of Mr. Carey himself, for it shows a desire, though vain indeed, to preserve a unity of faith, which is the most beautiful feature of what these horror-stricken gentlemen call "Romanism," and is found in no other religion.

"*Low-Popery.*"—We learn from the *Spirit of Missions* (through the *Banner of the Cross*), that "three thousand dollars per annum are pledged for the support of three *unmarried* missionaries to China." This is one of those unwilling admissions of the superiority of our discipline, that our Protestant brethren are occasionally compelled to make—we value it the more on that account. We gather from the same source, that under the imposed condition, no candidates "have yet offered for the work." No one will wonder at the intelligence, for "this is a hard saying, who can hear it?" *Celibacy and China!* The conjunction must be dreadful to the imaginations of the "younger clergy," who are particularly appealed to, and with whom, it is alleged, rests "the whole responsibility of delay;"

because as we infer, the older ministers are disqualified by matrimony.

The Churches of the Reformation have been slow in learning what the results of their first experiments with a married clergy should have taught them. What, for example, can be more instructive than the case of Melancthon? His young bride was as remarkable for her warmth of affection, as the young professor for his coldness of manner. Ever full of anxiety for her husband, Catharine was alarmed by the least appearance of danger to the object of her affection. When Melancthon proposed to take any step that might compromise his safety, she overwhelmed him with entreaties to renounce his intention. 'I was obliged,' wrote he, on one of those occasions, 'I was obliged to yield to her weakness—it is our lot.' How many instances of unfaithfulness in the Church, may have a similar origin," is the philosophical exclamation of the historian—a Protestant, we aver!—*Catholic Miscellany.*

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The History of Ireland, commencing with its earliest period, to the great expedition against Scotland, in 1545. By Thomas Moore, Esq. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard. 8vo. pp. 437.

This work has been laid on our table by the kindness of the enterprising publishers. The American edition is got up in a neat and creditable style, both as to type and paper. The work will be read with interest, as well for its great intrinsic worth, as on account of the well earned celebrity of its author. It looks like a task of supererogation to recommend to the public the production of an author who has never yet failed to delight, no matter in what branch of science or literature he chose to embark. His present work is another brilliant proof that the author's industry, research, and erudition are as consummate as his taste and genius are unequalled. His first chapters remove many of the doubts and mists that hang around the early history of Ireland, and show the claim of his country to a very remote origin from the Phenicians. "The Island of Saints" was, even in the days of her heathen worship, known to the Phenicians as the "Sacred Isle;" and the learning of her holy men, from the time of St. Patrick, is made to shine out through the gloom of the middle ages with great lustre and their good works are dwelt on with real Irish pride. The wrongs of his country brought on by domestic faction and Anglo-Saxon injustice combined, are graphically described. We regret that this history does not reach beyond the reign of Henry VIII, as every day from that time to this her story deepens in interest, and her condition at this moment is attracting the eyes of all Christendom to her people, and their great master spirit who has engraved his name upon the age in indelible characters. The work may be had at J. Murphy's Bookstore.

Catholic Family Bible. New York: D. & J. Sadlier.

The Messrs. Sadlier are now publishing in New York a new edition of the Catholic Family Bible, with the approbation of the Rt. Rev. Bishop Hughes. The first three numbers are now upon our table, and we can cheerfully recommend the work from the specimen we have as worthy of the patronage of all Catholics who are not already supplied with a family Bible. The type is full and distinct, and the paper of fine quality, and the work, which is illustrated with beautiful engravings, may be had at the low price of twenty-five cents per number, to be completed in sixteen numbers. For sale at J. Murphy's bookstore.

Six Historical Lectures on the origin and progress in England, of the change of religion, called the reformation. By Rev. J. Waterworth, M. A.

The first number of a new edition of Waterworth's Lectures on the Reformation from the press of M. Fithian, Philadelphia, has been received by us, and we hope that the zealous and worthy publisher will meet with encouragement sufficient to compensate him for an undertaking so laudable and so well performed.

A Manual of Catholic Melodies, Hymns, Psalms, &c. with the ordinary exercises of piety. Baltimore: John Murphy. Cap 8vo. pp. 448.

The publisher has politely afforded us an opportunity of examining the sheets of upwards of four hundred pages of this long looked for publication. The want of a judicious collection like the present, has long been felt by the Catholic community. This want is now supplied by the work just issued from the press of Mr. Murphy. The clergy of France and other Catholic countries have constantly encouraged the use of spiritual canticles in their missions, and borne testimony to the numerous benefits resulting from them. A desire that the same advantages might be extended to the faithful in this country, induced the author to prepare this Manual. "Although," as the preface remarks, "it may be found principally serviceable to young persons, it is designed as a manual for general use, and as such contains all the devotions desirable for ordinary occasions. The prayers and hymns have been selected from the most approved sources."

Of the typographical execution it were needless to speak; we deem the publisher's name a sufficient guaranty on this point. In our next we shall give a more extended notice of this novel and excellent production. In the mean time we strongly recommend it to public patronage.

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
3 8151 001 18610 2

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON, MASS.